

Aesch

Volume LXVIII

MARCH, 1953

Number 3

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 31 1953

CONTENTS

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM
PAGE

SCHAFFER, AARON.—Some Letters from an Unpublished Correspondence of Emile Deschamps,	145
CHAPMAN, ARNOLD.—‘Atala’ and ‘Niagara’: Further Comment,	150
GRUBBS, HENRY A.—The Division into Strophes of the ‘Chants de Maldoror,’	154
CHERPACK, C. C.—Some Senecan Analogies in the Anonymous ‘Epistola moral a Fabio,’	157
CROWLEY, F. J.—Some Unpublished Letters of Mme de Staël,	160
GRUBB, G. G.—Dickens’ Marchioness Identified,	162
MOORE, A. K.—Beowulf’s Dereliction in the Grendel Episode,	165
CAWLEY, A. C.—Iak Garcia of the ‘Prima Pastorum,’	169
GEROULD, G. H.—A Note on St. Caecilia,	173
ROCHE, C. E.—Thomas Hardy and C.-G. Etienne,	173
HUNTER, WM. B., JR.—Canterbury Tales V, 1031 ff.,	174

REVIEWS:—

HELMUT DE BOOR und RICHARD NEWALD, Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur. Fünfter Band (1570-1750) von RICHARD NEWALD. [Curt von Faber du Faur.]	174
HAROLD JANTZ, Goethe’s Faust as a Renaissance Man. [A. K. Bister.]	177
ADOLF RAPP (ed.), Briefwechsel zwischen Strauss und Vischer. [E. Feise.]	180
A. H. KNIGHT, Georg Büchner. [F. H. Mautner.]	183
VIVIENNE KOCH, W. B. Yeats: the Tragic Phase. [E. R. Wasserman.]	185
Z. S. HARRIS, Methods in Structural Linguistics. [Knud Togeby.]	190
D. W. ROBERTSON, Jr., and B. F. HUPPÉ, Piers Plowman and Scriptural Tradition. [R. W. Frank, Jr.]	194
JACOB HAMMER (ed.), Geoffrey of Monmouth. <i>Historia Regum Britanniae.</i> [W. A. Nitze.]	196
H. S. SNELLGROVE, The Lusignans in England, 1247-58. [F. A. Cazel, Jr.]	199
G. DE POERCK, La Draperie médiévale en Flandre et an Artois. [Raphael Levy.]	200
ALWIN KUHN, Romanische Philologie. [Raphael Levy.]	202
HENRI PEYRE, Connaissance de Baudelaire. [J. C. McLaren.]	204
L. LE SAGE, Jean Giraudoux, Surrealism, and the German Romantic Ideal. [B. A. Morrisette.]	206
A. LORTHOLARY, Le Mirage russe en France au XVIII ^e siècle. [H. C. Lancaster.]	208
E. L. AVERY, Congreve’s Plays on the Eighteenth Century Stage. [Dougal MacMillan.]	209
HEINRICH STRAUmann, American Literature in the Twentieth Century. [Christof Wegelin.]	211
BRIEF MENTION: Charlier et Mortier (eds.), Une Suite de l’Encyclopédie, <i>Le Journal encyclopédique</i> (1756-93); A. SCHIROKAUER (ed.), Texte zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Tierfabel; G. DU VAIR, The Moral Philosophie of the Stoicks, Englished by THOMAS JAMES, edited by RUDOLF KIRK,	213
CORRESPONDENCE: “Wanderer” Lines 50-57; Again on “Pythonissa, Faust II,” line 9135,	214

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18, MD.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
KEMP MALONE
ARNO SCHIROKAUER

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis,
L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the Current annual volume is \$6.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$6.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price one dollar.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MP*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RR*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

CHAPTERS on CHAUCER

by KEMP MALONE

HERE is the perfect book to accompany the study of Chaucer, written by a foremost scholar of mediaeval literature. After an introductory chapter which places Geoffrey Chaucer and the fourteenth century into the proper literary and historical setting, Dr. Malone focuses his attention on the poems themselves, ex-

ploring the poet's methods, analyzing his technique, interpreting his stories in the light of the period in which he lived. The greater part of this work is devoted to a study of *Troilus and Criseyde* and to *The Canterbury Tales*, although the shorter poems come in for their share of critical attention. \$3.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

litors
on the
script
articles
o the
es of
Quo-
, not
MP,
litors
iness

tors
the
cript
icles
the
g of
Quo
not
MP.,
tors
ness

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVIII

MARCH, 1953

Number 3

SOME LETTERS FROM AN UNPUBLISHED CORRESPONDENCE OF EMILE DESCHAMPS

The University of Texas has purchased a collection of some three hundred letters most of which were written by Emile Deschamps to Jules and Virginie Croze (de Croze after 1829, when Jules was made a baron) over a period of nearly forty years (1822-60). Many of the letters are purely personal in character and they reflect an amazing (often an excessively romantic) warmth of friendship which withstood differences of attitude on matters literary, political, and even religious. The relationship is mentioned several times by M. Henri Girard in his monograph, *Emile Deschamps: un bourgeois dilettante à l'époque romantique* (Paris, Champion, 1921), but if the letters to the Crozes were available to him, he made no use of them. At the outset of the correspondence, Croze was living at Corbeil, not far from Versailles, as a "sous-préfet" in the department of Seine-et-Oise; he frequently visited the capital, where his wife's parents had a home at no. 17, rue du Cherche-Midi. He would seem to have had literary aspirations and, in any case, he was on very friendly terms with most of the young men who were soon to unite as "rédacteurs" of *la Muse française*—Soumet, Guiraud, Vigny, and St.-Valry, in addition to Deschamps. As specimens of the tone of "vieille politesse française" which characterizes the entire collection and of the interests of the two men at the time of their composition, five relatively short letters (many of those written in and after 1830 are much longer) are here presented. All belong to the year 1822 and are addressed: "A Monsieur Jules Croze, sous-préfet à Corbeil, Seine-et-Oise."

I.

To be noted in the first letter, dated Paris, 31 mai, are the references to the "albums" so much in vogue among the bluestockings of the day, to "ma pauvre Colombe" (obviously Deschamps') "la Colombe et le chevalier," published as early as 1816, according to Girard, *op. cit.*, p. 41, in the *Almanach des Muses*, and found, in revised form, in the Lemerre edition of the *Oeuvres complètes*, I, 85-87), to Alexandre Guiraud's five-act tragedy, *les Machabées*, ou *le Martyre* (Deschamps spells it Macchabées), first performed at the Odéon on June 14, 1822 (Ephraïm was the eldest of the seven sons who, with their heroic mother, preferred torture and death at the hands of Antiochus to renunciation of their faith), to Adolphe de St.-Valry, to Alfred de Vigny, and the poet's father, Jacques Deschamps de Saint-Amand, and his wife, Aglaé, née Viénot. Note, also, the direct quotations from the well-known children's song and game, "le Furet du bois joli":

Pour cette fois, mon cher Jules, je suis fier, et je le suis parce que tous les jolis reproches tombent juste à faux. D'abord j'ai lu et relu votre longue lettre que j'ai trouvée bien courte, ensuite je n'y ai point répondu parce que je vous ai cru en voyage, enfin je n'ai rien oublié de ce que madame Croze a eu la bonté de me recommander, parce qu'il est de toute impossibilité d'oublier rien de ce qui vient d'une femme aimable; et la preuve c'est que ma pauvre Colombe figure la première sur l'Album (vous savez que les premiers seront les derniers, et je n'ai pas balancé à prendre les devants). Du reste, comme je l'écrivais à Guiraud en lui faisant passer le doux Registre, j'ai mis mon gros sol dans le tire-lire poétique, c'est à tous vos amis à y mettre la pièce d'or. L'Album fait le tour de nous tous, je ne sais précisément entre quelles mains il est à cette heure, ce qu'il y a de sûr, c'est qu'il a passé par ici et qu'il se retrouvera comme le furet du bois-joli. C'est notre aimable et bon Guiraud qui en est responsable par devers moi, mais comme vous le dites fort bien, il est dans toutes les horreurs d'une répétition, il est torturé comme son Ephraïm et il faut le ménager beaucoup jusqu'au 8 du mois de juin (dans huit jours), le grand jour de fête et de victoire. Vous y serez, n'est-ce pas? Il ne peut arriver rien d'agréable à qui que ce soit d'entre nous sans vous en soyez (sic) et, pour mon compte, si je devais être joué sur quelque théâtre, je serais bien heureux que madame Croze voulût bien y assister quand ce ne serait que pour tomber à ses pieds—cela amortirait sensiblement la chute. Ainsi vous nous pardonnez à tous, n'est-ce pas? et vous viendrez nous le dire le 8 juin.

J'ai vu hier M. de St.-Valry qui a eu le plaisir de vous voir à Corbeil ces jours derniers, c'est un de nos bons amis et un jeune homme de beau-

coup de talent; il m'a fait bien plaisir de venir me visiter. Nous avons parlé de vous.

M. de Vigny sort de chez mon père; il est on ne peut plus sensible à votre souvenir. Il me prie de ne pas vous dire qu'il demeure *Rue du Faubourg St.-Honoré* no. 76, parce qu'il est toujours à la campagne jusqu'au mois de juillet, où il vient prendre son service à Paris. Ses vers sont charmants et j'étais sûr qu'ils vous plairaient.

Adieu, car je suis aussi bavard que vous êtes taciturne. Plaignez-moi et aimez-moi toujours. Croiriez-vous qu'on m'occupe tant à des chiffres que je n'ai pu encore aller à une répétition des *Macchabées*! Après cela, grondez-moi si vous l'osez. Votre ami bien sincère.

Em. Deschamps

P. S. Madame Croze veut-elle bien agréer mes respectueux hommages? Mon père et ma femme veulent être de moitié dans tout ce que je vous dis de tendre.

II.

Five days later, on June 5, Deschamps announces a change in the date of the first performance of *les Macchabées* (as he spells it); actually, the play was first given at the Odéon on June 14 (*vide* Porel et Monval: *l'Odéon*, vol. II, p. 36). Guiraud is so eager to have his friends attend that he will leave tickets for seats in his own box at the home of the parents of Madame Croze in the rue du Cherche-Midi.

Que vous ayez tort ou raison, mon cher Jules, peu importe, vous êtes toujours charmant. Cela dit, j'en viens au fait de ma lettre, car il ne s'agit pas qu'elle soit jolie, mais prompte.

Vous saurez donc que selon toute apparence *les Macchabées* ne seront joués que lundi ou mardi et non samedi prochain, des retards indispensables viennent toujours à la traverse des grandes affaires. Au reste nous nous en félicitons tous, car de cette manière la sous-préfecture et la fête-Dieu vous possèderont tout au long, et vous n'aurez plus à faire deux voyages coup sur coup par la chaleur excessive qui nous accable. Guiraud aura le plaisir de vous écrire pour vous annoncer en temps utile et officiellement le jour décisif, et aussi pour vous gronder d'avoir si peu compté sur son souvenir et sur son amitié. Quand je lui ai parlé de la loge à retenir, il m'aurait, je crois, précipité des 4^{mes}; depuis huit jours la loge destinée à madame Croze était marquée, c'est celle de l'auteur et il espère que vous voudrez bien la remplir. Il en fera déposer les billets rue du Cherche-Midi, aussitôt après vous avoir écrit. Ainsi soyez fort tranquille et apprêtez-vous cependant à une gronderie amicale.

Je ne sais, moi, comment me préparer à ce que madame Croze veut bien nommer des remerciements. Comme c'est moi qui suis l'obligé dans cette affaire, nous ne pourrons pas nous entendre, mais j'aurai toujours du plaisir à l'écouter. En attendant faites agréer mes respectueux hommages.

Mon père et ma femme ne veulent jamais être oubliés quand je vous parle d'amitié, et votre souvenir leur est très précieux. Adieu, croyez-moi pour toujours votre bien bon ami.

Emile D.

III.

On October 16, Deschamps happily informs his friend of his promotion to the rank of "sous-chef" in the "Administration des domaines" in which he had been serving (as his father had served for many years before him) since 1812. Note the poet's joy at not having to leave his father (who was to die in 1826, at the advanced age of 85). He expresses the hope that Croze is planning to attend the "premières" of Soumet's two plays, *Saül* and *Clytemnestre*, the latter of which was first performed at the Comédie-française on Nov. 7, 1822, and the former at the Odéon two days later.

Vous me témoinez tant d'amitié, mon cher Jules, que je ne crains pas de vous entretenir un moment de moi et de ce qui vient de m'arriver d'agréable. Je reçois ma nomination à l'emploi de sous-chef à l'administration centrale. C'était toute mon ambition parce que j'obtiens ainsi un avancement sans déplacement. Vous me connaissez peut-être assez pour croire que je ne parlerais pas d'un petit avantage de position s'il ne s'y mêlait un intérêt de cœur; me voilà certain de ne plus quitter mon vieux et excellent père; il est heureux lui-même de cette certitude et vous partagerez notre joie pour la doubler.

Nous nous verrons, j'espère, à *Saül* et *Clytemnestre*. Tous nos amis vous désirent et vous appellent et moi, je vous embrasse de tout mon cœur.

Votre ami pour la vie,
Emile Deschamps

P. S. Seriez-vous assez bon pour me donner des nouvelles de madame votre mère et de madame Croze à qui je vous prie de faire agréer mes plus respectueux hommages.

IV.

Deschamps had earlier sent Croze a copy of Guiraud's *les Machabées* (Paris, Tardieu, 1822); on Dec. 4, he writes that he is sending him, under separate cover, a copy of what he calls the A' [sic] edition of Vigny's *le Trapiste*. This would seem to be a brochure containing a half-dozen of Vigny's early poems announced in the *Journal de la librairie* for Dec. 7, 1822 (*vide* E. Estève's "édition critique" of the *Poèmes antiques et modernes*, Paris, Hachette, 1942, p. viii).

J'ai réclamé, mon cher Jules, de M. de Vigny la faveur de mettre votre adresse sur l'exemplaire du trapiste (sic) dont il vous prie ainsi que

madame Croze d'agrérer l'hommage. Je me rappelle que c'est une adresse parcellé qui m'a valu la charmante lettre de reconnaissance que vous m'avez écrite. Ma foi, la reconnaissance faite au sujet des *Macchabées*, je trouve très doux de prolonger cette situation pour le *Trapiste* qui est un autre ouvrage du premier mérite. La A^e édition en paraît aujourd'hui et c'est vous et moi qui en avons les 1^{ers} exemplaires.

M. de Vigny est rappelé sur-le-champ à son régiment qui est à Orléans, sans quoi il aurait eu l'honneur d'aller offrir lui-même son oeuvre à madame Croze. Il me charge de vous dire comment il est sensible à l'accueil que vous lui vouliez faire dans votre vice-royauté et je vous le dis sans autre phrase.

J'ai bien regretté de ne pas m'être trouvé chez moi l'autre dimanche. C'est un triste hazard (sic), car je suis toujours garde-malade. Cependant ma femme va mieux, ce qui ne veut pas dire bien encore.

Adieu, écrivez-moi que vous et tout ce qui vous est cher est (sic) en bonne santé afin de me dédommager de la longue maladie dont je souffre autant que ma malade. Mon père et moi nous mettons tous nos hommages aux pieds de madame Croze et nous vous assurons de notre bien vive amitié.

Emile Des (sic)

N^a. Le trapiste vous parviendra en même temps que cette lettre qui part par le même courrier.

V.

At the end of the same month, Deschamps reports that Guiraud is back in Paris (probably from Limoux, in southern France, where he had factories) and that Aglaé is slowly recovering from her illness. He mentions Jacques Ancelot (1794-1854), a playwright soon to be one of the contributors to *la Muse française*, and Jean-François Roger (1776-1842), one of the founders of the ultra-conservative *Société des bonnes lettres*, which Deschamps did not join, though Chateaubriand, Nodier, and Hugo were members. On Dec. 29, then, Deschamps wrote Croze as follows:

Guiraud est arrivé, mon cher ami, et vous le savez sans doute, d'une manière plus directe, mais j'en ai tant de plaisir que je vous l'apprends comme si vous l'ignoriez. Voilà une personne de plus pour parler de vous avec moi et ce n'est pas peu de chose dans ma vie qui est assez sombre depuis quelque temps, à cause de la mauvaise santé de ma femme et de la tristesse que sa maladie répand dans notre maison et sur mon père dont le grand âge aurait besoin d'images gracieuses. Cependant mes inquiétudes ont beaucoup diminué, mais l'hiver (sic) perpétuera la faiblesse et je ne chanterai qu'avec les oiseaux du printemps, si je chante.

Je compte beaucoup sur les voeux que vous m'adressez, mon cher Jules, et si les miens sont exaucés, vous n'en aurez guère à faire pour la suite.

Madame Croze voudra-t-elle bien agréer l'honneur des mêmes voeux que dans les autres temps j'eusse été si heureux de lui porter?

Adieu, mon bon ami, je suis heureux que mes autres amis aient du talent à vos yeux et ils en sont fiers.

J'ai vu chez Ancelot M. Roger qui a toujours autant d'esprit et d'amabilité que s'il ne vous avait pas quitté.

Adieu, adieu.

Emile Des (sic)

These five letters give some indication of the spirit which prevailed among the writers who gathered in the rue Saint-Florentin, where Emile and Aglaé Deschamps shared an apartment with the octogenarian Jacques Deschamps de Saint-Amand, on the eve of the founding of *la Muse française*. From 1823 to 1860 (after August, 1830, the Crozes divided their time between their château de Chassaigne not far from Brioude in the Haute-Loire and their apartment in the capital), Deschamps reported frequently, and sometimes at great length, on social, literary, and political events that might be expected to interest his "meilleurs amis" (as he often addressed them). But this is another, and much longer, story.

AARON SCHAFER

The University of Texas

ATALA AND NIÁGARA: FURTHER COMMENT

Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo came to the conclusion that José María Heredia, while giving his own deep feelings at Niagara, had borrowed colors from Chateaubriand's richer and more varied palette in describing the scene.¹ Although this observation is accurate in principle, it is somewhat misleading as to the quantity of the borrowing, and is subject to revision on point of fact.

Menéndez y Pelayo shows that one passage of *Niágara* parallels a section of the Epilogue to *Atala*; and for the comparison he uses the Spanish translation of Manuel M. Flamant (Madrid, 1854), explaining, "Para evitar toda sombra de parcialidad, copiaré la traducción más divulgada entre nosotros."² It is possible, however, to come closer to the form in which Heredia read at least one portion of the Epilogue. In a well-known letter relating his visit

¹ *Historia de la poesía hispano-americana* (Madrid, 1911), I, 245, note.

² *Ibid.*, I, 243, note 1.

to Niagara, the poet observes, "La imagen de Chateaubriand es tan verdadera como bella: 'no parece río, sino un mar cuyos torrentes se agolpan a la anchurosa boca de un abismo.'"³ It is not surprising, in view of the dates, that the words he quotes do not correspond exactly to Flamant's; but it is noteworthy that except for one interchangeable preposition—"a" for "en"—they are precisely those of a translation made in Spain more than two decades before *Niágara* was written.⁴ Inasmuch as this phrase is not a literal rendering but quite distinctive, it is certain that Heredia did consult some translation in the same epoch that he wrote the ode.

There can be no doubt that the resemblance of Heredia's word picture to Chateaubriand's is more than accidental, at least in the portion beginning "Mas llegan . . . saltan . . ." and ending "Al solitario cazador espanta."⁵ Not only are the details identical in many instances but also the order in which they are presented. If further proof of Heredia's predilection for *Atala* were needed, it could be found in the fact, mentioned by Menéndez y Pelayo, that

³ José María Heredia, *Revisiones literarias*, ed. José María Chacón y Calvo (Havana, 1947), p. 56. The letter, dated June 17, 1824, and first printed in *La Moda Semanal del Bello Sexo* in 1830, is now available in several anthologies.

⁴ *Atala ó los amores de dos salvajes en el desierto* (Valencia: José Ferrera de Orga, 1813), tercera impresión, p. 154. The first printing was in Valencia, 1803. The translator signs himself P. G. R. The first translation of *Atala* to be made in Spain, it had also an edition "nuevamente corregida" in Madrid, 1822. Fray Servando, author of the first Spanish translation, Paris, 1801, claimed that P. G. R. copied him, but Sarraih finds the Valencia version quite different from the Paris. The same scholar also mentions, of translations available before 1824, an 1823 edition of the Valencia, 1808 and 1823 of a Barcelona version, and an 1822 reprinting of the Paris; but he has not seen all these he lists. See Jean Sarraih, "La Fortune d'*Atala* en Espagne (1801-1833)," in *Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal* (Madrid, 1925), I, 255-268; and E. Allison Peers, "La influencia de Chateaubriand en España," *Revista de Filología Española*, XI (1924), 353 and 368.

⁵ Reference is to the first published version, New York, 1825, as reprinted in *Poesías completas de José María Heredia*, ed. Emilio Roig de Leuchsenring (Havana, 1940), II, 221-224. Since both readings are equally indebted to Chateaubriand, it is difficult to understand why Menéndez y Pelayo, after praising the 1825 text—the basis, incidentally, of his *Antología* selection—grounds his later discussion on the 1832 Toluca, notwithstanding its "frases afectadas."

Heredia wrote a poem entitled *Atala*, where the Indian maiden addresses Chactas. Furthermore, a month before Heredia went to Niagara he recommended to his sister that she read of it in *Atala*.⁶

Nevertheless, even in these twelve lines of the poem additional comment is appropriate. Although Heredia, like Chateaubriand, rounds off with a simile on the rising mist of the falls, instead of the smoke of a conflagration ("embrasement" in the original) he puts "pirámide." Undoubtedly this substitution was suggested by another prose source, John Howison's *Sketches of Upper Canada*.⁷ Likewise, where Chateaubriand finishes his picture with forest animals, Heredia speaks of the "solitario cazador." To this departure Heredia's letter furnishes a possible explanation. Recounting his crossing to Goat Island, he says, "Lo que hallé fué un sinnúmero de palomas torcaces, que me hicieron echar de menos la famosa escopeta que tantos sustos dió a las cotorras de Jesús María."⁸ The solitary hunter thus gains meaning as a projection of the poet's own boyhood.

Moreover, there are entire lines which in spite of Menéndez y Pelayo's inclusion as examples of the Chateaubriand influence are not so to be explained:

. . . mil olas
Cual pensamiento rápidas pasando,
Chocan, y se enfurecen,
Y otras mil, y otras mil ya las alcanzan,
Y entre espuma y fragor desaparecen.

An erroneous idea had been given by the Flamant translation, which

⁶ Francisco González del Valle, *Cronología herediana* (Havana, 1938), p. 147.

⁷ This commercial traveller, whom Heredia admires for his poetic enthusiasm, and from whom in his letter he translates a passage of more than two hundred words, twice remarks on the peculiar nature of the cloud formation: "A host of pyramidal clouds rose majestically, one after another, from the abyss at the bottom of the Fall" (*Sketches of Upper Canada*, Edinburgh and London, 1822, p. 108); "The water . . . is shattered the moment it drops over the rock, and loses . . . the character of a fluid, being divided into pyramidal-shaped fragments, the bases of which are turned upwards" (pp. 109-110).

⁸ *Revisiones literarias*, p. 54. The possibility that Heredia actually saw a hunter is remote. Howison: "The country around Niagara Falls is thickly inhabited . . . and in high state of cultivation: and there are several houses very near the cataract" (p. 117).

reads, "El Niágara . . . en el momento de la caída es menos un río que un mar, cuyos atronadores torrentes se empujan y chocan a la entreabierta boca de un abismo."⁹ "Atronadores" does not correspond, in connection with this passage, to anything in either Chateaubriand's French or the version Heredia quotes, and hence for this case is gratuitous; "se empujan y chocan" is decidedly more elaborate than "se agolpan" or "se present" and therefore, while it might have appeared to explain Heredia's enumerative image it does not: in fact, it more probably shows the influence of Heredia on Flamant.

The rapids of the Niagara River above the falls, and not the falls themselves, are the center of Heredia's attention. While drawing on *Atala*, he chooses mainly details that can be verified from upstream where he says he wrote; passing over other temptingly dramatic features of Chateaubriand's landscape. Heredia's self-restraint is a kind of artistic integrity; one can separate what he saw at the creative instant and made into poetry from what he did not see but for which, in the interest of completeness, he borrowed from others.¹⁰

As to why he did not, either before or after this moment, examine the face of the falls for poetic material, the story is fairly clear: he was not satisfied with his sight of them from below. In the letter he tells that at the foot of the cataracts vapors and, later, storm clouds hid them from view. Finally, there is the complaint:

. . . disipa un tanto
Las tinieblas que en torno te circundan,
Y déjame mirar tu faz serena.

From the letter it is abundantly clear that the rapids, on the other hand, compelled his amazement and induced the rapture

⁹ *Historia de la poesía hispano-americana*, I, 243.

¹⁰ For Heredia's indebtedness to the North American poet John Gardiner Calkins Brainard in his "The Fall of Niagara," see Manuel Sanguily, "Una estrofa sobre el Niágara en Heredia y dos poetas yanquis," in *Literatura universal* (Madrid, n. d.), pp. 245-259; and González del Valle, "Mis trabajos heredianos," *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, XLVI (1940), 206. Brainard's poem was printed at least as early as April, 1824 (two months before *Niágara* was written) in the first issue of the *United States Literary Gazette*. Menéndez y Pelayo takes no cognizance of the question, although Sanguily's article first appeared in 1907.

necessary to generate the poem. The germ of the "mil olas" image is, for example, here: "Al acercarse las olas al precipicio toman una dirección opuesta al declive, y chocan unas con otras, como si quisieran evitar la fatalidad irresistible que las impele, hasta que vencidas al fin se despeñan en el abismo . . ." (*Rev. lit.*, p. 52). He sees the dramatic sequence of his life, as a Byronic struggle against an overwhelming Fate, and writes from this intensely personal experience.

That Heredia's borrowing from *Atala* is less extensive and even less significant in the total plan of the poem than Menéndez y Pelayo suggests is therefore apparent. The description of the falls is primarily a decorative adjunct to Heredia's real impressions of the scene and his interpretation of it through simile.

ARNOLD CHAPMAN

University of California, Berkeley

THE DIVISION INTO STROPHES OF THE *CHANTS DE MALDOROR*

When the complete text of the *Chants de Maldoror* of Isidore Ducasse, Comte de Lautréamont, was printed in 1869, the work was divided into six *chants*, each of which was broken up into smaller divisions, called *strophes* (by the author himself). These divisions were clearly indicated, in every case, by spacing and a bar, but they were not numbered, except in Chant vi, where the last eight, which form a unit (the Mervyn episode), were preceded by the Roman numerals I-VIII. Any one who can count will find that there was a total of 60 strophes (Chant i, 14; Chant ii, 16; Chant iii, 5; Chant iv, 8; Chant v, 7; Chant vi, 10).

The "edition" issued in 1874 was identical with that printed in 1869, except for the cover and the title page, and when the book was reprinted in 1890, the original arrangement was maintained.

Since 1920, the complete text of the *Chants de Maldoror* has been reprinted nearly a dozen times. But, in spite of the principle, rather widely accepted in our century, that—unless there are good reasons not to—one should reproduce a text in the definitive form given it by the author, only one of the twentieth-century editions

(GLM, 1938) preserves the arrangement made by Isidore Ducasse. The unfortunate Comte de Lautréamont, doomed to die in obscurity, has also been doomed to what many scholars will consider an even worse fate—extremely careless editing of his works.

As I said above, the original edition of the *Chants de Maldoror* did not number the strophes, except for the last eight, which form a unit. A certain number of the editors have decided that it would be useful to number the strophes consecutively. There is no doubt that such a numbering has its advantages for reference purposes, but, in that case, it should be done correctly. The first twentieth-century editor (Editions de la Sirène, 1920) numbered the strophes consecutively, but came out with a total of 59 instead of 60, by the simple process of giving the number "42" to two strophes in succession. This editor also disregarded the numbering of the last eight strophes of Chant vi in Roman numerals. One might say that the Sirène, 1920, edition established a sort of "canon" for future editors of the *Maldoror*: that the total number of strophes was not 60, but 59 (or even, 58, according to some), and that the author's numbering in Roman numerals of the last eight strophes was to be disregarded.

The next edition (Au Sans Pareil, 1925, edited by Philippe Soupault) reproduced the arrangement of the Sirène edition, repeating the numbering and the error.

When the same Soupault put out the complete works of Lautréamont in 1927 (Au Sans Pareil), he removed the numbering of the strophes (and he did not reinstate the Roman numerals for the last eight), and he indicated the divisions by spacing and a bar. In two places (in between strophes 8 and 9, pp. 73-74, and in between strophes 36 and 37, pp. 215-216),¹ where a strophe ends at the bottom of a page, the spacing and bar were omitted. This led to further errors on the part of later editors (apparently M. Soupault's 1927 edition served as the basis for several other editions).

Three editions were published in the year 1938. That edited with an introduction by André Breton (Editions GLM) was unique, in that it quite simply reproduced the arrangement of the first edition of the *Chants de Maldoror*. Of the two others, that

¹ The numbers I give for strophes are those obtained by counting consecutively the strophes in the original editions, or in the 1938, GLM, edition.

published by the Editions José Corti, with an introduction by Edmond Jaloux, contains 58 unnumbered strophes, with the separations indicated by a star. The errors of the 1927, Soupault, edition were repeated: that is, strophes 8 and 9 form one strophe, as do strophes 36 and 37. The other edition of that year (Agence Centrale de Librairie) gives 59 numbered strophes. Strophes 8 and 9 are distinct, but 36 and 37 are combined into one.

An edition published at Buenos Aires during the War (Vian, 1944), without any introduction or editorial apparatus, numbers the strophes consecutively . . . and correctly!

The centenary of Isidore Ducasse's birth, 1946, was commemorated by the appearance of three more editions. The text published in that year by José Corti, with an excellent introduction by Roger Caillois, is possibly the most confused of all. This is unfortunate, since it is the edition currently available in Paris bookstores. In this Corti edition the division into strophes given in the text (the strophes are not numbered, the breaks being indicated by stars) does not correspond to that found in the table of contents, where the strophes are identified by first lines. The table of contents follows the division given by the 1938, Agence Centrale de Librairie, edition, with strophes 36 and 37 combined,—a total of 59 strophes. In the text, strophes 8 and 9 are combined, then the strophes are divided correctly up to the end, where strophe 60 is combined with strophe 59—giving a total of 58. The publisher seems to have discovered that in the original editions (and in the 1938 GLM edition as well) the Mervyn episode (the last eight strophes of Chant vi) was numbered in Roman numerals—therefore he inserted the Roman numerals in his edition. Since he had no strophe 60, he stopped his numbering at vii. How he could have failed to notice that, where the Roman numerals were used in earlier editions, they ran from i to viii, it is hard to imagine.

In the "Edition du Centenaire" published by M. Soupault in 1946 (Editions Charlot), the strophes are not numbered, and since the breaks between them are indicated merely by spaces, it is not always easy to determine whether or not a division is intended. A new error is found here—the combination of strophes 10 and 11, thus again giving a total of 59. Needless to say, M. Soupault ignored the use of Roman numerals for the Mervyn episode.

The edition published by Editions de La Jeune Parque (1947),

with an introduction by Julien Gracq, is identical, with regard to division into strophes, numbering of strophes, etc., with that published by the Agence Centrale de Librairie in 1938.

The most recent edition is that published in 1950, by Le Club Français du Livre, with an introduction by Maurice Blanchot. In arrangement, it is identical to the *text* (not the table of contents) of the 1946, Corti, edition: that is, 58 strophes, not numbered—8 and 9 and 59 and 60 each forming one strophe, and the Mervyn episode, divided into 7 instead of 8 strophes, being given the Roman numerals I-VII.

At least two commentators of Lautréamont² have decided that the consecutive numbering of strophes is convenient for reference purposes, and have referred to passages by the number of the strophe. The preceding analysis shows that, unless one has in hand the particular edition used by the commentator, one cannot rely on these references.

It is to be hoped (but I am not too optimistic) that future editors of the *Chants de Maldoror* will see this article, and avoid the errors of their predecessors.

HENRY A. GRUBBS

Oberlin College

SOME SENECHAN ANALOGIES IN THE ANONYMOUS
EPÍSTOLA MORAL A FABIO

The flavor of much of the *Epistola moral a Fabio* is distinctly Horatian. Not only has this late 16th-century work the general characteristics of the *sermo*, i. e., the informal style, the moral *exempla* drawn from personal experience and quotidian affairs, but also some of Horace's favorite themes, notably, the *beatus ille*, and the *aurea mediocritas*. For this reason, Menéndez Pelayo compares the poem to Boscan's *Epistola a Mendoza*,¹ whose Horatian vein has been explored by Arnold G. Reichenberger.²

Senecan analogies in the *Epistola moral*, if touched on at all,

² Maurice Blanchot, *Lautréamont et Sade*, Paris, 1949, and Maurice Heine, "Maldoror et la belle dame," *Minotaure*, no 12-13, pp. 87-88, 1939.

¹ *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*, Madrid, 1906, XIII, 314-315.

² "Boscan's *Epistola a Mendoza*," *HR*, XIII (1949), 1-18.

have been mentioned only in passing.³ Yet the *Ad Lucilium Epistolarium* contains many parallels in word and thought with sections of this poem which are close enough to stand out from what might otherwise be termed a general *ambiance* of stoicism.

The first three tercets of the *Epistola moral* read:

Fabio, las esperanzas cortesanas
Prisiones son do el ambicioso muere
Y donde al más astuto nacen canas.

El que no las limare o las rompiere,
Ni el nombre de varón ha merecido,
Ni subir al honor que pretendiere.

El ánimo plebeyo y abatido
Elija, en sus intentos temeroso,
Primero estar suspenso que caído.

In Seneca's twenty-second letter to Lucilius, we find the same sentiments expressed in relation to the ties of business:

Sed idem illud existimo leni eundum via, ut
quod male implicuisti soluas quam abrumpas,
dumodo, si alia soluendi ratio non erit, vel
abrumpas. Nemo tan timidus est, ut malit semper
pendere quam semel cadere.⁴

Tercets 56 and 57 of the *Epistola moral*:

Quiero imitar al pueblo en el vestido,
En las costumbres sólo a los mejores,
Sin presumir de roto y mal ceñido.

No resplandeza el oro y los colores
En nuestro traje, ni tampoco sea
Igual al de los dóricos cantores

are paralleled in the fifth letter to Lucilius:

Intus omnia dissimilia sint, frons populo
nostro conveniat. Non splendeat toga, nec
sordeat quidem.⁵

³ Hurtado y Palencia, in their *Historia de la literatura española*, Madrid, 1949, p. 498, recall the theme of *De Constantia Sapientis*. Guillermo Díaz-Plaja, in *La poesía lírica española*, Barcelona [Colección Labor], 1937, p. 213, suggests an antecedent of the opening tercets of the poem in *De Tranquillitate Animi*, x, which is dissimilar in expression and contrary in sentiment, however.

⁴ *L. Annaei Senecae Opera*, ed. C. R. Fickert, Leipzig, 1842, I, 94.

⁵ Fickert, I, 15. One of Menéndez Pelayo's marginal notations on the

In tercets 59 and 60 of the Spanish poem, an example of moral balance is introduced:

En el plebeyo barro mal tostado
Hubo ya quien bebió tan ambicioso
Como en el vaso murrímo preciado;

Y alguno tan illustre y generoso
Que usó, como si fuera plata neta,
Del cristal transparente y luminoso.

In the same fifth letter, Seneca writes:

Magnus ille est, qui fietilibus sic
utitur quemamodum argento, nec ille
minor est, qui sic argento utitur
quemamodum fietilibus.*

These *rapprochements* have the obvious advantage over scattered classical reminiscences, as noted by Menéndez Pelayo, of concentration, being drawn from a single work, and of ideational continuity, since they parallel sentiments expressed in two or more successive tercets in the poem. Such analogies also suggest that the *Epístola moral* is a more pregnant example than has been noted of the true *contaminatio*.

CLIFTON C. CHERPACK

Baltimore

Epístola moral, published by M. Artigas as "Algunas fuentes de la *Epístola moral a Fabio*," BBMP, VII (1925), 270-274, compares to tercets 56 and 57 the following lines from Lucretius (*De Rerum Natura*, V, V, 1427):

At nos nihil laedit veste carere purpurea, atque
auro signisque rigentibus apta; dum plebeia tamen
sit, quae defendere possit.

Although "el oro y los colores" are found in this excerpt, no essential contrast between the two kinds of garments is made, nor are the sentiments of tercet 56 found in the context.

* Fickert, I, 17. Menéndez Pelayo, according to Artigas, *loc. cit.*, recalls another classical antecedent for tercet 59 which seems, however, rather vague. He has noted Horace, *Sat.*, I, 2, 114-115:

Num tibi cum fauces urit sitis, aurea quaeris
Pocula . . . ?

SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF MME DE STAËL

Madame de Staël spent a year of exile in England, from June 1813 to May 1814, and was lionized on all sides as an enemy of Napoleon. The following letter, apparently to her London bankers, reveals her continuing interest in helping her less fortunate compatriots in the hard days of exile. I have been unable to identify the object of her charity here but it would seem to be a French captain of her acquaintance. Her good business sense is evident in the precautions she suggests to prevent the funds going astray. This was one of her last acts in England as she left for France on May 8, 1814:¹

je vous prie Messieurs de vouloir bien payer dix guinées à l'adresse de l'officier dont voici l'adresse dans (?) la lettre ci jointe et de les porter pr mon compte—mille compliments.

N. de Staël h

lundy ce 6 may 1814

Si par hasard le capitaine était parti je vous prie de ne pas lui envoyer de l'argent—ayez donc l'extrême bonté d'écrire à quelqu'un de cette ville pour que l'argent ne soit délivré qu'à l'homme même *pr son reçu*—pardon de cet embarras mais c'est une bonne œuvre et vous l'aimez.

Madame de Staël had no particular reason for liking the name of Sydney Smith, at least in so far as it was borne by the founder (with Jeffrey and Lord Brougham) of the *Edinburgh Review*. She was a dinner guest on several occasions of Lord and Lady Holland at Holland House and there² seems to have made the acquaintance of the bitter critic of her *Delphine* whose ungracious, brutal comments could hardly have been forgotten in the intervening years. Yet there was another Sidney Smith whom she would doubtless have found more to her liking and who would have been her rival in self-adulation. He was Sir William Sidney Smith, more commonly known as Sir Sidney Smith (1764-1840), a naval officer³ who fancied himself a diplomat and who saw service under Rodney,

¹ Permission to publish these letters has been graciously granted by the Henry E. Huntington Library.

² Gunnell, Doris. "Mme. de Staël en Angleterre: une année d'exil (juin 1813-mai 1814)" in *RHL*, xx, 877.

³ He attained the rank of admiral in 1821.

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF MME DE STAËL 161

Hood and Nelson. Like herself he led a rather eventful life which included: service on the personal staff of Gustavus III of Sweden who made him knight grand cross of the Order of the Sword for his services against Russia; service against the French wherein he was captured and imprisoned in the Temple for two years; and a role in effecting the escape of the royal family of Portugal. His major claim to fame and to the fulsome interest of our author was his complete frustration of Napoleon's siege of St. Jean d'Acre in the winter and spring of 1799. This exploit was a decisive check to French arms in the East and won him the thanks of both houses of Parliament and a pension. He accompanied Wellington's army from Waterloo to Paris where the Iron Duke invested him with the insignia of the K. C. B. at the Palais Bourbon. He spent his declining years in Paris and was buried at the Père La Chaise with a monument to his memory. The following, most gracious letter reveals his interest in Germaine and hers in him, and one can't resist musing on the enthusiastic conversation these two arch enemies of Napoleon would have had.

J'ai été vivement flatté en voyant un passage de mes écrits servant d'épigraphie à la lettre de Sir Sidney Smith mais j'aurais mieux fait pour définir l'esprit de chevalerie de m'en tenir à la vie du héros de st. Jean d'Acre—un mauvais hasard m'a empêchée de rencontrer Sir Sidney Smith mais partout j'ai parlé de lui et partout où l'on sentait le prix de l'héroïsme militaire guidé par la justice, je l'ai vu généralement admiré

j'ose le prier d'agrérer mes hommages

Necker de Stael Holstein

Coppet Suisse
ce 23 juillet
1816

On the back: To Sir Sidney Smith
No: 53 Rue Faubourg St. Honore

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

*University of California,
Los Angeles*

DICKENS' MARCHIONESS IDENTIFIED

Mr. William Crosby Bennett's article entitled "The Mystery of the Marchioness"¹ is a model of hypothetical reasoning in scholarship which lacks only *documentary evidence* to establish his conclusion that the Marchioness was the illegitimate daughter of Daniel Quilp and Miss Sally Brass. In this note I propose to furnish that evidence, and, if possible, answer some questions as to Dickens' purpose and artistry in his treatment of the Marchioness.²

Who, indeed, was this abused child? Who was her mother? her father? It is no longer necessary to build up hypothetical answers, however convincing.

There is a cancelled passage in the corrected proof sheets of *The Old Curiosity Shop* preserved in the Forster-Dyce Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum³ that answers these questions beyond peradventure of doubt. When Miss Sally had been summoned before the Notary to answer for her part in the plot against Kit, Dickens originally wrote the following startling confession which I here publish for the first time. The cancelled passage is that which appears within the square brackets:

The lovely Sarah, now with her arms folded, and now with her hands clasped behind her, paced the room with manly strides while her brother was thus employed, and sometimes stopped to pull out her snuff-box and bite the lid. [Gradually drawing in these walks, nearer and nearer Sampson, she suddenly gave vent to the emotion that stirred within her by twisting her right hand in his more than auburn locks, and shaking him desperately.

"Help, help!" cried Brass. "Gentlemen, I must be protected from personal violence. This fellow will be the death of me."

"Look at me," said Sally, "look at me and tell me.—What do you say of the first cause of all this—of that false and treacherous little serpent, eh?"

"Curse and confound her," returned Brass between his teeth. "I wish I had her here, that's all."

"*You* wish you had her here!" retorted Sally. "What do *I* wish, do you think?"

¹ *The Dickensian*, xxxvi (Autumn Number, 1940), 205-208.

² This note has been prepared under a Carnegie Grant-in-Aid.

³ Quoted here by permission of the authorities of the Victoria and Albert Museum.

"Much the same, I suppose," said Sampson coolly, "It's not worse for you than for me."

Miss Sally folded her arms, and pressing her lips close together, and swaying herself from side to side, looked steadfastly at her brother.

"It's no worse!" she said, "no worse for the artful wretch to be the ruin of her own mother!"

Mr. Brass looked around the room, and under the table, as if for the parent in question; and again raised his eyes to his sister's face.

"It's no worse, I ask you," repeated Sarah, "for her to be my ruin than yours?"

"Gentlemen," said Brass, turning pale, "there's a little distraction going on here. You had better put that tray of forks out of the way, and take particular care of your penknives if you please."

Miss Brass smiled loftily at these fears, and folding her arms a little tighter, replied,

"I am her mother. She is my child. There. Now what do you say?"

"Why, I say," said Brass, falling back in his chair, "don't talk nonsense. Your child? I don't believe such a thing's possible. I am sure it isn't. It couldn't be. I'd sooner believe in Mrs. Southcote and *her* child. Non-sense!"

Giving utterance to this last word in a loud tone and with strong emphasis, Sampson bent over his writing again, and shook his head until he could shake it no longer.

The beautiful vision said no more, but resumed her walking up and down the room, and in perfect indifference to all that passed, and even to her brother's troubled state of mind regarding herself and her late disclosure, which vented itself all that day in the constant utterance of such phrases as "I'll never believe it possible! — It couldn't be — Don't tell me — Non-sense!" and the like, which he repeated, sometimes over and over again in a paroxysm of several minutes' duration, and sometimes singly, and at long intervals; but always with uncommon vehemence. Of none of these expressions of wonder and incredulity, nor of the evident surprise and consternation of the three gentlemen, did Miss Brass take the slightest heed.] She continued to pace up and down until she was quite tired, and then fell asleep on a chair near the door.

So, at last we have *documentary evidence* that, in the mind of her creator, and in his original manuscript, as represented by his proof sheets based on that manuscript, the Marchioness was the daughter of Miss Sarah (Sally) Brass.

Who was the father of the Marchioness? The hideous dwarf, Daniel Quilp! When he first encountered the "small servant" and before Dick Swiveller christened her "the Marchioness," he was visibly moved, and immediately, in evident astonishment, began questioning her about herself, watching her narrowly, and stroking

his chin thoughtfully. "The result of this secret survey was, that he shaded his face with his hand and laughed slyly and noiselessly until every vein in it was swollen almost to bursting . . . Once on the street, moved by some secret impulse, he laughed and held his sides and laughed again. . . ."⁴

How does one account for Quilp's remarkable behavior upon his discovery of the "small servant"? The only adequate answer is that he suddenly recognizes in her dwarfism and, perhaps, in her features his own likeness, and remembers in his deep, wretched mind some former relationship to Miss Sally, and comprehends her cruel hatred of the child. Dickens closed the record with the following hint which Mr. Bennett turns to good account in his article mentioned above: "Sophronia [Swiveller's final name for the Marchioness] herself supposed she was an orphan; but Mr. Swiveller, putting slight circumstances together, often thought Miss Brass must know better than that; and, having heard from his wife of her strange interview with Quilp, entertained sundry misgivings whether that person, in his lifetime, might not also have been able to solve the riddle, had he chosen."⁵

While the main action of the plot of *The Old Curiosity Shop* was going forward, Dickens, with "the small servant's" parentage in mind, has been carefully laying down another series of events that were, at the time of writing, intended to close the jaws of an almost perfect Haman plot; for, in the meantime, Dick Swiveller has won the confidence of the "small servant," has given her food and drink, and has named her the "Marchioness." He has been dismissed from the service of the Brasses, has suffered a long illness, and at last returns to consciousness and finds that the Marchioness has run away from the Brasses, has been his nurse, and that she has overheard the conference between Miss Sally and Sampson in which the trap for Kit was devised. Dick then dispatches the Marchioness in all possible haste to inform Mr. Garland and the Notary of the situation. Thus, the Marchioness sets in motion the jaws of the Haman plot that had been intended to overwhelm Kit, but was destined to overwhelm Quilp and the Brasses. Miss Sally is summoned before the Notary, and there in a most dramatic scene, reveals the parentage of the Marchioness, and recognizes her

⁴ *The Old Curiosity Shop*, Ch. LI.

⁵ *Ibid.*, "Chapter the Last."

as the final cause of her and Quilp's disaster; and the despised and misused daughter of Miss Sally and Quilp becomes the direct agent of their destruction. In other words, they become the victims of their own folly and machinations.

Why did Dickens de-emphasize the Marchioness? Why did he fail to capitalize on this almost perfect sub-plot and thereby leave the identity of the Marchioness and her potentialities as a character dangling inartistically? Why did he delete the most dramatic scene in the entire story as it stood in galley proofs? The answer seems to be near at hand.

Suddenly, when reading his galley proofs, Dickens realized that the Marchioness was becoming a real threat to the supremacy of Little Nell. She was becoming a distractive element just when he wanted everything to converge upon his dying heroine; therefore, he decided to risk artistic incompleteness rather than raise up a rival of Little Nell.

GERALD G. GRUBB

Wake Forest College

BEOWULF'S DERELICTION IN THE GRENDEL EPISODE

Breaking open the door of Heorot, Grendel strides across the floor to a "magorinca hēap," selects a sleeping Geat (identified as Hōndsciōh at l. 2076),¹ and begins his night's feasting. Beowulf watches:

mēg Higelāces, under fērgripum	Prȳðswȳð behēold hū se mānscaða gefaran wolde.	ll. 736-38
-----------------------------------	--	------------

Instead of acting promptly to succor his comrade, the hero deliberately holds back in order to learn Grendel's methods,² though at the cost of the Geat's life. Significantly, this matter-of-fact statement is not phrased as an explanation. As far as anyone can judge from the passage, the poet was not sensible of a breach of the Germanic code; at the same time, the modern reader can scarcely

¹ Klaeber's 3d ed. of *Beowulf* is cited throughout.

² The "earliest example in English literature of the use of the scientific method," according to a facetious note in *The Explicator*, I (1942), item 1.

be indifferent to the apparent discrepancy between Beowulf's failure to act and the prevailing concept of loyalty.

Scholars have usually resolved the difficulty by reference to an underlying folktale structure—the *Bear's Son's Tale*,³ in which the hero had perforce to await his turn before assailing a supernatural being ensconced in a house. In the estimation of W. W. Lawrence:

The epic poet lamely motivated Beowulf's inaction: "The mighty one, the kinsman of Hygelac, watched to see how the evil scather would act as he attacked." Turn to the folk-tales, and the situation is clear: the younger hero had to wait until his older or more renowned companions had fought and failed.⁴

Chambers was likewise troubled by Beowulf's tactics:

But if we suppose the story to be derived from the folk-tale, we have an explanation. For in the folk-tale, the companions and the hero await the foe singly, in succession: the turn of the hero comes last, after all his companions have been put to shame. But Beowulf, who is represented as having specifically voyaged to Heorot in order to purge it, cannot leave the defence of the hall for the first night to one of his comrades. Hence the discomfiture of the comrade and the single-handed success of the hero have to be represented as simultaneous. The result is incongruous: Beowulf has to look on whilst his comrade is killed. (p. 64)

Klaeber (p. 155) appears content merely to ask the question: "Why does Bēowulf in the meantime remain lying on his bed?" and then, possibly without conviction, to refer the answer to the "original story."

It is at once apparent that these explanations are grounded on the assumptions that the poet acknowledged an overriding obligation to follow some version of the *Bear's Son's Tale* and that his audience was in a position to recognize that the solution of the problem resided in the folktale. In the absence of confirmation short of overwhelming, such interpretations as these are unsatisfactory, because in removing one defect they intimate another, namely, the poet's inability to assimilate his sources. Yet, neither Chambers nor Lawrence maintains that the poet followed any

³ R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf* (2d ed.; Cambridge, 1932), pp. 62-68, presents with discussion the salient features of this tale type, first studied extensively in connection with *Beowulf* by Friedrich Panzer, *Studien zur germanischen Sagengeschichte. I. Beowulf* (München, 1910).

⁴ *Beowulf and Epic Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), p. 176.

version scrupulously. Indeed, the latter freely grants that "when the folk-tale of 'The Bear's Son' was attached to a prince of the royal house of the Geatas . . . only such portions could be used as were suited to the historical setting." (p. 174) The question of the historicity of Beowulf aside, one can agree that the folktale, as judged from surviving versions, has been considerably altered in the epic; one cannot agree that the poet, if limited by the facts of history (as Lawrence implies), would at one crucial point, though not at others, yield to the dictation of the folktale. Of course, no one imagines that history and folktale coincided at this juncture. It is not unlikely that in the version of the *Bear's Son's Tale* known to the *Beowulf* poet the titanic struggle did occur in the presence of the hero's companion or companions, dead or alive. A bondi, it will be recalled, witnessed without injury to himself Grettir's analogous fight with Glam in the thirteenth-century *Grettissaga* (Ch. 35). But even though one or more thanes were killed by the monster in the folktale, the author would scarcely prove unequal to the task of removing or modifying the incongruous matter. And surely, other means were at hand to disclose Grendel's horrific eating habits.

Whether history actually exerted a compulsive force on the ordering of the scene in Heorot in all probability can never be known. From all appearances, the Danes provide a setting for the monster's depredations and Beowulf's exhibition of prowess—little more. To argue that the poet felt bound by historical fact in permitting Beowulf to remain silent while Grendel devoured the thane is to ignore the very unhistorical character of the proceedings. To insist upon the exigencies of Danish history is to slight the poet's plain intention of creating a heroic personage rather larger than life and, as Kemp Malone observes, as Christ-like as traditional Germanic ideals of conduct permitted.⁵ In short, the poem as a whole gives slight warrant for the belief that the poet meant a blot to stand in the escutcheon of the Geatish warrior. Yet, the apparent blot can be erased convincingly by reference neither to folklore nor to history, which are not demonstrably compulsive. If Beowulf's integrity is to be sustained, it must be sustained, in my opinion, by reference to the prerogatives of the tribal leader.

Any notion that the Germanic chieftain or king was duty bound,

⁵ "Beowulf," *English Studies*, XXIX (1948), 162.

regardless of consequences for a particular undertaking or for the welfare of the tribe, to plunge headlong into a fray to preserve the life of a follower is gainsaid by common sense and by Tacitus. The relationship of the leader to the comitatus is defined with reasonable clarity in the *Germania* (Ch. 14) :

In the field of action, it is disgraceful to the prince to be surpassed in valour by his companions; and not to vie with him in martial deeds, is equally a reproach to his followers. If he dies in the field, he who survives him survives to live in infamy. All are bound to defend their leader, to succour him in the heat of action, and to make even their own actions subservient to his renown. This is the bond of union, the most sacred obligation. The chief fights for victory; the followers for their chief.*

The implication seems plain: the followers must act to preserve the leader, who embodies the special virtues and ambitions of the tribe. He is in actuality the symbol of tribal security, solidarity, and continuity, and must therefore employ his powers as judiciously as possible. Accordingly, the poet's contemporaries perhaps regarded Beowulf's prudence as altogether proper rather than blameworthy. Surely, no one expected Byrhtnōð to place himself in the van of the English at Maldon; indeed, the battle had reached a crucial stage before the alderman of Essex "wāpen ūp āhōf, / bord tō gebeorge, and wið þæs beornes stōp."⁷ It may be taken for granted that the Germanic chieftain usually had to fight during the course of a battle, but he obviously was under no obligation to rush forward with the fall of the first man. True, the battle of Maldon (991) was an event of somewhat greater magnitude than the Grendel episode and rather different in other respects, though the consequences of failure were dire enough in either case. Had Beowulf acted rashly in Heorot and thus failed to defeat Grendel, the Danes would have remained in a desperate predicament and the Geats would have suffered a great loss of reputation—to say nothing of the likely destruction of the entire band. By comparison with the penalties of defeat, the loss of a single thane was insignificant.

Admittedly, this construction does not remove every difficulty from the hall scene. Still unexplained are the failure of the Geats

* *Works*, trans. Arthur Murphy (Everyman; London, 1908), pp. 320 f.

⁷ Bright's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, rev. J. R. Hulbert (New York, 1948), p. 153, ll. 130-31.

(if not dead drunk) to hear the noisy monster at the door and Beowulf's apparent unwillingness even to shout a warning to them. Nevertheless, his inaction can be largely explained in the light of what may be reasonably regarded as the Germanic view of the function of the leader—to act in the general rather than in the particular interest. The incident by this interpretation is removed from the category of a special case. Finally, without minimizing the importance of history and folklore for the comprehension and appreciation of the poem, I wish to suggest that to keep in mind the likelihood that Beowulf acted in accordance with a prevailing concept of leadership is to remove the sense of incongruity which his seeming remissness inevitably provokes.

ARTHUR K. MOORE

University of Kentucky

IAK GARCIO OF THE PRIMA PASTORUM

The *Prima Pastorum* in the Towneley manuscript (MS Huntington HM 1) has received scant attention by comparison with the *Secunda Pastorum*. This may be the reason why no one has questioned the right of Iak Garcio to an independent existence among the *dramatis personae* of the play (see EETS edition of *The Towneley Plays*, p. 100).¹

A. W. Pollard's side-note (p. 106, opposite l. 179) informs us that 'Jack the boy comes in.' If he really does, he must go out again after l. 190 (the last line attributed to him) because there are only the three Shepherds present a moment later—'Primus Pastor. Sytt we downe all thre' (l. 191)—and throughout the rest of the play. If, then, 'Jack the boy comes in' at l. 179, we should add 'Exit Iak Garcio' after l. 190.

But 'Iak Garcio'² is possibly another name for the Third

¹ Page and line references are to the *Prima Pastorum* in *The Towneley Plays*, edited by G. England and A. W. Pollard, EETS Ex. Ser. LXXI; but full use has been made of a photograph of the play in manuscript.

² 'Iak Garcio' is the name of the speaker to whom ll. 179-87 are attributed. He is simply called 'Garcio' as the speaker of the first half of l. 189, and of the last word of this line together with the line following (l. 190). 'Iak' in 'Iak Garcio' is possibly the boy's Christian name, with

Shepherd (Tercius Pastor),³ and not a new character. It is true that he apparently addresses the Shepherds as though there were more than two of them, telling them that they are 'foles all sam' (l. 179, in rhyme), and that of all the fools he has known 'ye thre bere the bell' (l. 186). But 'foles all sam' may mean 'both fools' (cf. 'Brether sam,' *Processus Noe*, l. 320).⁴ Moreover, in the manuscript there is a cross in the left-hand margin against l. 186, which may indicate that the copyist realised 'thre' to be an error.

There are some grounds for believing that Iak Garcio and Tercius Pastor are one and the same person. Apart from the word 'thre' (l. 186), there is nothing said by Iak Garcio that would not be appropriate in the mouth of Tercius Pastor. Again, Jack's very brief appearance in the play (ll. 179-90), and the absence of any good reason for bringing him into the play at all, are not typical of the highly skilled craftsmanship of the Wakefield Master. If the Wakefield author is attempting the sort of thing that the maker of Towle⁵ does in the Chester Shepherds' Play, he is bungling it very badly.

H. A. Eaton,⁶ who compares the comic episode of the Shepherds and their imaginary sheep with a similar tale told about the Men of Gotham, finds that the sarcastic comment at the end of the tale—

³ 'Garcio' added in order to distinguish him from 'Iak' (= 'Iohn horne') in l. 169; possibly, prefixed to 'Garcio' it forms a quasi-proper name (cf. 'Jack Sprat'; see *OED*, *Jack*, sb.1 35).

⁴ Tercius Pastor is called 'slaw pase' by the Second Shepherd in l. 125. But this is obviously a nickname or nonce-name, and does not rule out the possibility that his Christian name is 'Iak.'

⁵ K. Sisam's interpretation of these words is 'brothers both'; see *Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose* (Oxford, 1933), p. 264. J. E. Oxley prefers to interpret 'sam' in this context as a verb meaning 'to take hold of'; see *LTLS*, July 5 (1934), 476.

⁶ The Garcio in the Chester Shepherds' Play who, from the moment of his first appearance (l. 173), takes an active part in the play till the very end. M. Carey, *The Wakefield Group in the Towneley Cycle* (The Johns Hopkins University, 1926), p. 191, regards 'Jack as a sort of embryo "impudent servant"' of the same type as Trowle.

⁷ H. A. Eaton, 'A Source for the Towneley Prima Pastorum,' *MLN* XIV (1899), 265-8. The source referred to is No. 1 of the *Merry Tales of the Mad-men of Gotham*, printed by W. C. Hazlitt from an edition of 1630 in his *Shakespeare Jest Books*, iii, 4-5.

'Which was the wisest of all these three persons judge you?' is paralleled by Iak Garcio's words (ll. 184-6)—

Of all the foles I can tell,
ffrom heuen vnto hell,
ye thre bere the bell.

But he overlooks one important difference between the tale and the episode in the play. In the tale the third man is as silly as the other two because, in the process of proving to them how foolish they are, he empties the meal from his sack into a stream. In the play, however, the Third Shepherd pours the meal onto the ground; and then, having shown the First and Second Shepherds how emptyheaded they are, he tells them to gather up the meal and put it back into the sack (ll. 174-5)—

Geder vp
And seke it agane.⁷

He is master of the situation, as befits a man who can make such apt use of the age-old tale of Moll and her pitcher of milk (ll. 153-60).⁸ The Third Shepherd, unlike his companions, is no simpleton, nor does he deserve or need to be called a fool by Iak Garcio. It will be seen then that the traditional story (represented by the tale of the Men of Gotham) has been modified by the Wakefield playwright in one important particular. And it seems likely that the author of the *Prima Pastorum* deliberately made this modification in order to keep the number of Shepherds down to three, and to distinguish the Third Shepherd from the other two by the sharpness of his wits, as he does in the *Secunda Pastorum*. In other words, there is no reason for introducing a new character into the play because the playwright has contrived to make a fourth character unnecessary.

Again, it is surely not an accident or the result of bad handling of dialogue that the Third Shepherd has nothing to say between the first and last words spoken by Iak Garcio (ll. 179-87, 189-90); and that, in fact, Iak Garcio takes the place of Tercius Pastor in

⁷ These words are ambiguous, and may refer either to the meal that is lying on the ground or to the scattered wits of the First and Second Shepherds. Tercius Pastor, in one sentence, is both telling them to recover their lost wits and to sack the meal again.

⁸ See G. H. Gerould, 'Moll of the *Prima Pastorum*', *MLN* xix (1904), 225-30.

the regular sequence of speakers—Tercius Pastor, Primus Pastor, Tercius Pastor, Secundus Pastor—which begins at l. 127 and continues till l. 212.

Finally, as the boy who has been minding the sheep (ll. 188-90), Iak Garcio corresponds exactly to the Third Shepherd of the *Secunda Pastorum* (ll. 177-82). It will also be observed that the Third Shepherd of the one play corresponds to the Third Shepherd of the other in some particulars (e. g. each of them seems to work for the Second Shepherd, each is anxious to have a meal, each complains about his allowance of food). If Iak Garcio and Tercius Pastor of the *Prima Pastorum* are one and the same person, it is not surprising that together they correspond to one person, namely the Third Shepherd, of the *Secunda Pastorum*.

If the above argument is sound, it must be supposed that the copyist who wrote ‘thre’ instead of ‘two’ (l. 186) was himself guilty of taking Iak Garcio to be a different person from Tercius Pastor, although the marginal cross referred to above seems to suggest that he later realised his error. In explanation of this error, it may be conjectured that he was misled by the tale of the Men of Gotham, in which the third man proves himself as stupid as the other two, and so took it upon himself to invent a new name and a new character at l. 179 who would comment sarcastically on the foolish behaviour of all three Shepherds. Or again, he could have found this name for Tercius Pastor in the text he was copying, and been misled by the tale of the Men of Gotham into believing that Iak Garcio was a different person from Tercius Pastor. In either case, the change of ‘two’ to ‘thre’ in l. 186 would naturally follow.⁹

A. C. CAWLEY

University of Leeds

⁹ It is just possible that MS ‘Iak garcio’ is a corruption of ‘tercius pastor.’ For the interchange of initial *I* and *t*, cf. ‘thom’ wrongly written for ‘Ihon’ in l. 85; again, the -*ci-* of ‘tercius’ together look very much like -*a-* in the manuscript. Also, MS ‘garcio’ resembles ‘pastor,’ with long -*r-* like long -*s*, -*c-* and -*t-* closely similar, and the upward curl of the abbreviation mark after -*t* suggestive of an -*o*. It may be noticed here that the *EETS* editor gets into trouble over the names of this play, giving ‘Horne’ in mistake for ‘Slow-pace’ in his side-note opposite l. 192, and ‘Gill’ in mistake for ‘Slow-pace’ opposite l. 282.

A NOTE ON ST. CAECILIA

When preparing the chapter on the *Second Nun's Tale* for *Sources and Analogues on Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, 1940, I had not read a notable study by H. Delehaye on the legends attributed to November and December celebrating Roman martyrs. This book, entitled *Étude sur le légendier romain, les saints de Novembre et de Décembre*, Bruxelles, 1936, should have come to my attention at that time for the sake of the masterly study of the origin and development of the legend of St. Caecilia which it includes, pp. 76-96. By good fortune nothing in Father Delehaye's pages invalidated my conclusions as to Chaucer's sources, but students of the *Second Nun's Tale* should be aware that the authorities cited in the final paragraph of Professor Robinson's explanatory note, p. 863, have been superseded.

G. H. GEROULD

Princeton University

THOMAS HARDY AND C.-G. ETIENNE

The song that Clym Yeobright sings in *The Return of the Native*, Book IV, Chap. II, is taken from Act II, scene 8 of Charles-Guillaume Etienne's *Gulistan*, a comic opera presented in 1805 and revived in 1844. The song, which begins "Le point du jour," contains three strophes, of which Yeobright sings the first and third.

CHARLES EDWARD ROCHE

Brookline, Mass.

CANTERBURY TALES V, 1031 ff.

In his attempt to win Dorigen in the Franklin's Tale, Aurelius prays to Apollo, the sun, that he assist him by swaying the influence of the moon, Lucina, so that high tides may cover the rocks. Robinson, in his edition, remarks that this is a rather unusual complication; Lowes has compared it with a prayer in the Filocolo. But surely the point is that Aurelius seeks to violate the heroine's chastity; hence he could hardly pray directly to Lucina since she, better known as Diana, was also the goddess of chastity. And no better way of seeking her influence appears than that of beseeching Apollo, her brother, for help.

WM. B. HUNTER, JR.

Wofford College

REVIEWS

Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Von HELMUT DE BOOR UND RICHARD NEWALD. Fünfter Band: *Die Deutsche Literatur vom Späthumanismus zur Empfindsamkeit. 1570-1750.* Von RICHARD NEWALD. München: C. H. BECK, 1951.

Diese neue, lang erwünschte Geschichte der Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts sucht in grossen Linien festzuhalten, was aus den zahlreichen Arbeiten über das Barock in den letzten Jahrzehnten abzuleiten war, aus den zusammenfassenden Wertungen von Cysarz, Hankamer, Strich, Stammler und Günther Müller, wie auch aus den Ergebnissen zahlreicher Einzeluntersuchungen. Ein klares und übersichtliches Buch ist entstanden, das sich ebenso fernhält von gesuchter Tiefendeutung wie von oberflächlicher Aufzählung. Wiewohl es ausführlich zu den kulturellen wie den formalen Problemen Stellung nimmt, die der Periode ihre Farbe geben, ist es zugleich als praktisches Lehrbuch und Leitfaden angelegt, für den die Studenten dankbar sein werden, denen im Grunde immer noch Carl Lemckes *Geschichte der Deutschen Dichtung* von 1871 dienen musste, ein ausgezeichnetes aber stark veraltetes Werk.

Newald gibt vier Abschnitte, von denen der erste und letzte allerdings eher zum Rahmen gehören als zum Bild. Sie sind aus anderem Stoff. Nur der zweite Abschnitt "Im Zeichen der Poetik" und der dritte "Schwulst und Prosa" enthalten die Darstellung des Barock, auf die es doch vor allem ankommt. Aber während der leitende Gesichtspunkt in dem ersten einen brauchbaren roten Faden abgibt, bringt der letztere im Grunde Inkongruentes—wie schon die inkongruente Überschrift anzeigt.

Der Verfasser stösst auf einige grundsätzliche Schwierigkeiten, die sich bei einer Darstellung dieser Periode ergeben: Es fehlen mit Ausnahme von Opitz die überragenden und zentralen Persönlichkeiten, um die herum sich eine Übersicht schaffen lässt. So ist Opitz Herr von Newalds zweitem Abschnitt. Aber ihm fehlt die dichterische Schöpferkraft, und die Folgenden, die sie besassen: Fleming, Rist, Gryphius, Dach, Paul Gerhard, Angelus Silesius, Hofmannswalda, waren nicht stark genug eine Einheit zu schaffen. So ist der Systematiker immer gezwungen einige Gewalt anzuwenden, denn die grossen Räume der Architektur sind gegeben aber das Ameublement passt nicht immer zur Architektur.

Man fühlt aus Newalds Darstellung, dass die Epoche dem Geheimnis des eigentlich Dichterischen nahesstand. Es dichtete ja in seiner Architektur, in seiner Politik, in seinen Festen und in seiner Kleidung, Perücke, Halskrause und Stiefelstulpen führen durchaus eine Eigenexistenz. Warum es nicht zu Höchstleistungen kommt, ist eine Frage, die der Autor nicht aufwirft. Bescheiden begnügt er sich, "das Schrifttum nach seinem Inhalt und seiner Bedeutung" darzustellen.

Dies ist ihm in manchen Abschnitten ausgezeichnet gelungen. Zu allem Systematischen bietet das Buch noch eine Fülle von biographischen Daten, von Inhaltsangaben und Spezialwertungen, die künftig jedem Studenten des Barocks die Arbeit nicht wenig erleichtern werden. Schade nur, dass selbst bei flüchtigerem Lesen so viele kleine Einzelfehler und Irrtümer einem in das Gesicht springen, Unrichtigkeiten und Ungenauigkeiten, die eine gewisse Unvertrautheit mit dem jeweils angeführten Autor oder einem Werk zu bekunden scheinen. Oder es bleiben Irrtümer bestehen, welche die Forschung längst widerlegt hat, wie zum Beispiel (S. 158), dass Opitz den Winter 1620-21 bei Hamilton in Jütland verbracht habe, während Max Rubensohn bereits 1899 in *Euphorion* VI nachgewiesen hat, dass Hamilton ein unbemittelter Hauslehrer war, der überdies, wie ein Brief Janus' Gruterus beweist, in diesem Winter in Frankreich und der Schweiz weilte. Ernst Schwabe von der Heides Gedichte erschienen nicht 1616 in Frankfurt. Sie wurden nie gedruckt. Philipp Marnix' Werk heisst nicht *Bienenkorf*, sondern *Beyenkorf* oder verdeutscht *Bienenkorf*.—

S. 166: Das Haus Schaffgotsch war nicht gräflich, sondern freiherrlich. Hans Ulrich von Schaffgotsch, dem die *Hercinia* (nicht *Hercynia!*) gewidmet ist, erreichte die angestrebte Grafenwürde nie.

S. 167: "Lob des Feldlebens" ist dasselbe Gedicht wie "Lust des Feldbawes," nur der Titel wurde verändert.

S. 204: Ludwig von Anhalt wurde erst nach Casper von Teutlebens Tode offiziell Vorstand der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft. Er widmete ihr viel Zeit, wie seine Korrespondenz erweist. Tobias Hübners Gesellschaftsname war 'Der Nutzbare.' Loredanos Buch, das Werder übersetzte, heisst *Diane*, nicht *Diana*.

S. 209: Dachs Werk heisst *Sorbiusa*, nicht (wie auch in der Zeittafel) *Sorbiusa*.

S. 210: Das Kapitel über die Pegnitzschäfer ist sehr ungleich ausgefallen. Ein Nürnberger Stadtbibliothekar und Pfarrer Johann Saubert, Grossvater von Daniel Omeis, wird als ältestes Mitglied der Gesellschaft angeführt, er war es nie. Die Bemerkung Herdegens, er sei "vordester Antistes" gewesen, muss das Missverständnis erzeugt haben. Saubert, der Nicht-Dichter, erhält ebenso viel Raum wie der bedeutende Johann Michael Dilherr. Johann Hellwig trat nicht 1649, sondern 1645 in den Orden ein. Vier Zeilen weiter wird behauptet, dass er von 1649 an keine Verbindung mehr mit den Pegnitzschäfern aufrecht erhalten habe. Die *Nymphe Noris* erschien aber 1650 und ist in enger Zusammenarbeit mit Birken entstanden. Auch die Verbindung mit Helianthus-Volkamer bestand bis zu Hellwigs Tode fort. Volkamer veranlasste Lukas Schrök, ein Werk Hellwigs noch 1680 herauszugeben, das den Lebenslauf und ein Portrait des Verfassers enthielt.

S. 212: Katharina Regina von Greiffenberg war nie Mitglied der Pegnitzschäfer.

S. 249 wird dann auch festgestellt, dass sie "keine Gemeinschaft mit den Pegnitzschäfern" hatte. Der wichtige Heinrich Arnold Stockfleth ist nur flüchtig unter "Pietismus" erwähnt. Sein bedeutender Roman *Macarie* von 1669 und die ebenso wichtige Fortsetzung seiner Gattin sind vergessen. Das Schlimmste ist, dass Sigmund von Birkens Rolle, sein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des hochbarocken Stils, durchaus verkannt wurde. Er ist kaum behandelt.

S. 247: Rist verfasste zehn Sammlungen geistlicher Lieder, nicht drei. Die eine heisst nicht *Sabbatinische Seelenkunst*, wie die Zeittafel angibt, auch nicht *Sabbatische Seelenkunst*, wie es im Text heisst, sondern *Sabbatische Seelenlust*.

S. 248: Anna Owena Hoyers ist kaum behandelt. Es fehlt besonders eine Würdigung ihrer drastischen Dialektdichtung.

S. 270: Kuhlmanns *Entsprössene Deutsche Palmen* sind nicht verloren. Sie erschienen bei der Wittwe Johann Seyfferts in Oels, 1670, 20 Seiten in Fol. in Frakturschrift. Das Titelblatt und ein Teil des Textes sind wiedergegeben in Fr. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert *Andreas Gryphius' Lateinische und Deutsche Jugenddichtungen*, Leipzig, 1938.

S. 298: Moscherosch wurde in Hanau nicht von "Neid und Missgunst verfolgt," sondern er machte sich eines groben Vertrauensmissbrauchs schuldig. Die Untersuchungen Max Huffschmids, Artur Bechtolds und Johann Koltermanns haben viel Material zum Leben Moscheroschs beigebracht. Zum beanstandeten Satz vgl. hauptsächlich Koltermanns Aufsatz in *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* N. F. 49, 1936. Ob Amos Comenius die in der "Reformation" gedruckten Briefe verfasst hat, ist recht zweifelhaft. A. C. vor dem Datum kann "Anno Christi" bedeuten.

S. 315: Der im Ergänzungsband zur Reihe 'Barock' in Heinz Kindermanns *Deutscher Literatur* so ausführlich behandelte und in seiner Bedeutung erkannte Johann Plavius ist vergessen und nur als Zielscheibe für Sacer's Spott erwähnt.

S. 362: Auch hier auf derselben Seite ein offensbarer Widerspruch: "Schottel mag mittelbar oder unmittelbar auf seine (Anton Ulrich von Braunschweigs) Ausbildung von Einfluss gewesen sein." Drittletzte Zeile: "Als Schüler von Schottel . . . bemühte sich Anton Ulrich. . . ."

S. 217: Ungenaue Titel: *Simplicissimi Pralerey und Gepräng* und *Zwey Köpfiger Ratio Status* wären richtig.

S. 417: Johann Khuen war Weltgeistlicher, nicht Jesuit. Er dichtete nicht für "die Bauern seiner Dorfgemeinde," sondern für die Münchner; die Kirche im Krottental lag in einem Vorort, er war das Haupt der Münchner Monodistenschule (vergleiche A. Einsteins Besprechung eines Referats von B. A. Wallner in *Zeitschrift für Musik* II, 445). Alle seine Bücher enthalten ausschliesslich sangbare Lieder, Khuen hat alle seine Gedichte vertont, manche zweimal. "Das letzte der acht Bücher seines *Epithalamium* bringt sangbare Lieder" erweckt den Eindruck, als habe der Verfasser Khuen nur aus Cyszar's Anthologie gekannt, daher auch die Behauptung, dass er das alte Totentanzmotiv wiederaufleben liess. Von dem 23 Bücher umfassenden Werke Khuens scheint Newald nichts als das *Epithalamium* bekannt zu sein. Khuen war gräflich Warttenbergischer Hauskaplan und verwaltete später eine Benefiziatenstelle an der Peterskirche in München. Er baute bewusst eine Bayrische Sonderliteratur auf, die dialektnah, antipopitzisch, antiprotestantisch und nur insofern bäuerlich war, als München immer eine etwas ländliche Atmosphäre behalten hat. Die wichtigen 3 Bände der *Tabernacula* hätten unbedingt behandelt werden müssen, zumal da Prokop von Templin, Martin von Cochem und der Mirant ausführlich gewürdigt werden.

Der auf derselben Seite und in der Zeittafel genannte Jesuit heisst Nakatenus, nicht Nekatenus.

In der Zeittafel fehlen die beiden Ausgaben von Opitz' Gedichten von 1624 und 1625. Auch ist der Aufenthalt des Dichters in Königsberg von 1638 erwähnt und nicht die viel wichtigere Übersiedlung nach Danzig.

Schirmers *Rosen Gepüsche* erschienen 1657, nicht die (ebenfalls unrichtig benannten) *Rauten Gepüsche*.

Diese Ausstellungen könnten als arge Schulmeisterei erscheinen, aber hier liegt ein Schulbuch vor und solche Fehler sollten vermieden sein. Sie beeinträchtigen den Wert des sonst verdienstlichen Werks. Aber vielleicht ist diese Verbindung von Fleiss und Flüchtigkeit dem Antithetischen angepasst, das ja einen der hervorragendsten Stilzüge des Barock bildet.

CURT VON FABER DU FAUR

Yale University

Goethe's Faust as a Renaissance Man: Parallels and Prototypes.

By HAROLD JANTZ. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp. xvii, 198.

As a reader familiar with Faust commentaries and interpretations, but only scantly acquainted with source material on Renaissance thought I found this solid, ably written monograph exciting and rewarding. This is indeed a new approach. The author's thesis, boldly stated, thoroughly supported, and tolerantly argued, seems irrefutable to me and proves to be so fruitful that no Faust commentator will wish to ignore it henceforth.

"The chief question posed by the study," says Mr. Jantz in concluding (p. 124), "is whether the values and principles . . . of the drama . . . resemble those of the Renaissance more than they do those of Goethe's own age. The answer seems to be, yes,

they do. . . . In its own intellectual atmosphere . . . [the drama] lives and breathes. . . . By contrast, it seems to be out of its element in the eighteenth century, for Goethe took into his *Faust* phases of Renaissance conviction and imagination with which his own epoch for the most part was not concerned."

What are these phases of Renaissance conviction and imagination? The author, first, sets them off against what they are not: not the clear-cut dualism of good versus evil found in medieval dogmatism, in the naive tales of the *Faust* book, and in eighteenth century idealism; not the man-centered humanism and rationalism, the Storm-and-Stress type of self-assertion, the sentimental nature concept of the eighteenth century, nor the nineteenth century type of social gospel. Goethe shared in all these, to be sure; many of his works reflect them, including *Faust*. But essentially, *Faust*, work of a life-time, was conceived, and developed, as a cosmic drama in the Renaissance spirit. Goethe tells us that he studied the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries intensively at the time he began *Faust*; we must follow him and see what he found there and what his creative genius made of it in the poetic drama.

The creative impulse, as the author demonstrates in nine brief and substantial chapters, was the superb integration, achieved by Renaissance thinkers and doers, of Graeco-Roman and Judaic-Christian concepts of man's place within the cosmos of beings and forces: Man's function, as quoted, partly, in the words of the Platonist Ficino (p. 104) and summarized by the author as follows, is to stand in a conciliatory middle relation between the earthly and the heavenly, elevating the one by transmitting to it the power of the other. There is no thought of denouncing the earthly as primarily evil; there is, nevertheless, full awareness of the tension and conflict in man's allotted role; for man, created as a potential microcosm, has in his nature a due portion of that primordial chaos out of which cosmos and light were born through the seed-power of the divine Logos. Man, with his free choice, can bring his microcosm into ever more perfect harmonic correspondence to the macrocosm; or he can sink down, or stop short on the way up. Error, guilt, and tragic failure are inherent in his lot; they do not damn him, neither does the God-given precariousness of his position exonerate him in failure unless he goes on striving.

A continuous 'Faustian' tradition in Renaissance Europe is sketched, with which Goethe very likely was in contact, beginning in mid-fifteenth century with Nicolaus Cusanus and Pico della Mirandola, whose *Oration on the Dignity of Man* is quoted, in part. Both Cusanus and Pico turn from book learning to nature and to experience to learn what harmony, or affinity, or sympathy, as the Greeks called it, holds the universe together; both observe phenomena, and see them as symbols of the one truth, God. Other creative men of the Renaissance, beside holding to these principles,

are known to have *lived* them—Leonardo, Michelangelo, Lorenzo di Medici. Dürer and his *Melencolia I* are discussed, Giordano Bruno, Edmund Spenser, and Torquato Tasso in sonnets, Cellini and Montaigne in their autobiographies; Paracelsus; Agrippa von Nettesheim, the titles alone of whose main works sound ‘Faustian’ enough: *On the vanity of all knowledge; on the occult philosophy; on the excellence of woman*; Elizabethan John Dee and the later George Strik and Robert Fludd; Shakespeare’s Prospero, certainly, whom young Goethe is much more likely to have known than Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus; and, very significant, Johannes Kepler in his *Harmonices*. Faust is a Renaissance man in that “he stands as the most vital and eloquent symbol of its distinctive and central drive: the will to all-inclusive synthesis . . .” (p. 126) “a flesh-and-blood man of passionate energy and uncheckable drive toward a succession of goals, the meaningful pattern of which becomes gradually clearer only as the end approaches” (p. 47). Other quotations demonstrate that the Renaissance magus was a deeply reverent man, that he was superstitiously misrepresented in the *Faust* book by the orthodox, and that Goethe restored him to his true status.

In separate chapters, first, the background is discussed; then, Wagner, Mephisto, and the aerial spirits; then Faust’s intellectual position, following Cusanus; Nature and Nostradamus; the Earth Spirit; the two souls and the translation scene; and, finally, the unity of *Faust*. All of these topics are dealt with in soberly reasoned scrutinies. I quote from p. 114, as an example: “Professor Faust was not being an irresponsible subjectivist at this point [in proceeding from ‘Wort’ to ‘Sinn’ to ‘Kraft’ to ‘Tat’ in translating ‘logos’], he was being an excellent classical philologist, solidly traditional and thoroughly grounded in the history of the concept from Heraclitus to St. John.” This history is presented in the preceding page, with copious source references in the *Notes*. Secondary sources are widely drawn upon—Cassierer, Arnold, Robb—and used with perceptive caution: “It is possible that Cassierer, perhaps unwittingly, learned from Goethe what was central about these early Renaissance philosophers from Cusanus onward. [If so, the striking parallels Cassierer points out may prove nothing, of course—]. . . However, . . .” (p. 45). This remark shrewdly anticipated a criticism I was about to make.

From his new standpoint the author elucidates certain well-known *Faust* controversies. On p. 47 he mentions the moralists and abstractionists who “maintain that such a representative figure [as Faust] should either have been more ideally formed or that the author should have indicated his repudiation of him plainly and unmistakably; certainly God should not have committed the shocking indiscretion of translating that disturbing old reprobate into heaven.” The inference is clear. In another context (p. 136)

"two equally wrong claims" that have been made concerning *Faust* are dealt with: "one, that it is a sure and sufficient guide for modern man; two, that it has nothing to offer our times except a warning example against everything 'Faustian.'" The author's answer: we should turn to *Faust*, a poetic masterpiece, "not to learn precepts for life, but to learn life. And life is in it in symbolic, truthful statement, life in all its achievement, in all its frustration, in all its glory, in all its grimness, not as the idealist poet would like it to be, but as the objective poet knows it is."

The 135 pages of the argument have all supporting quotations in English, and the whole reads well. 50 pages of notes, in the same clear and large print, give each quotation in its original language and its exact source. More detailed argumentation is also given here. The *Preface*, by anticipating certain aspects of the argument, took the edge off my keen expectancy when in the first chapter, *Backgrounds*, I came upon repetition of points already made. The approaches and methods used speak for themselves; they needed no apology, it seemed to me. The newness of the approach to *Faust* criticism, the sure, levelheaded, and mature argumentation, the measured weighing of the results, the awareness of limitations and pitfalls, the wide reading in many fields, the scrupulous documentation, the clear style—all combine to make this study a significant publication.

ADA KLETT BISTER

Vassar College

Briefwechsel zwischen Strauß und Vischer. Hrg. von ADOLF RAPP.

Erster Band: 1836-1851. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 1952. 328 S. DM 10.-

Seit der Veröffentlichung von Otto Güntters *Mein Lebenswerk* mit seinem Bericht über die Gründung und Bedeutung der Deutschen Schillergesellschaft und die Erbauung des Schiller-Nationalmuseums mit seinem wachsenden Bestande schwäbischer Dichter sind vier Jahre vergangen, ehe dieser 18. Band des Vereins erscheinen konnte, dessen Drucklegung lange geplant aber durch das politische und ökonomische Unglück Deutschlands immer wieder vereitelt wurde. Der erste vorliegende Band des Briefwechsels enthält die Korrespondenz der beiden Freunde von 1836-1851, herausgegeben von Professor Adolf Rapp, dem Verfasser des 1911 erschienenen Buches über *Friedrich Theodor Vischer und die Politik*.

In seiner Einführung gibt uns Rapp eine kurze Lebensbeschreibung Strauß' und Vischers mit klarer Charakterisierung ihrer Persönlichkeit sowie ihrer Art und Kunst des Briefstils, fügt in den Anmerkungen des Buches diesem Bilde noch wichtige Züge

hinz zu aus ihren Briefen an seinen Großvater Ernst Rapp, der mit beiden befreundet war, und erläutert in überleitenden Einstüben Anlaß und Gelegenheit des Äußerungen zugleich mit kurzen Resumés etwaiger unwesentlicher Streichungen.

Es erscheint uns von vornherein erstaunlich, daß diese dem Temperament nach so unendlich verschiedenen Menschen in enger und langer Freundschaft, die freilich zuweilen bedroht ist, miteinander gelebt haben. Aber sie waren Jugendfreunde, am gleichen Ort, Ludwigsburg, geboren und verbunden durch Schul- und Jugenderlebnisse, durch gemeinsame Kämpfe in schwerer Zeit gegen philosophische, religiöse, politische Gegner, durch ihren Ausgang von Hegel, ihre Liebe zu deutschem und schwäbischen Wesen, ja durch ähnliche Enttäuschungen in der Ehe und im Amte. Strauß wird ein akademisches Lehramt in Württemberg und in der Schweiz versagt, Vischer wird noch 1842 ein Ordinariat verweigert. Beide sind aufrechte, rechtschaffene Männer und Forscher, mit großem Mut zu freier Meinung in jener trüben Zeit der Zensur und der Verfolgung liberaler Geister. Strauß ist ein stiller, scheuer Melancholiker trotz seiner Unerbittlichkeit und Konsequenz in Urteil und Tat, wenn es auf geistige Entscheidungen ankommt, unpolitisch, schwer beweglich; Vischer ein sanguinischer Draufgänger, oft naturburschenhaft, aber auch er in sich herumbohrend, sich mit Selbstvorwürfen quälend beim geringsten Kompromiß, allerdings gewöhnlich nach der Tat, während Strauß vorsichtig, langsam, gerecht wägt und wertet.

Sie stellen einander Aufgaben, ermutigen sich zur Behandlung von Problemen, beurteilen gegenseitig ihre Arbeiten, beraten einander in schwierigen Lebenslagen und analysieren ihre Eigenheiten und Verschiedenheiten.

"Ganz gleichartig sind unsere beiden NATUREN darin," schreibt Strauß am 4. Februar 1849, "daß sie künstlerisch-wissenschaftlich sind. Den Unterschied in dieser Einheit möchte ich so ausdrücken, daß Du ein wissenschaftlicher Künstler, ich ein künstlerischer Wissenschaftler bin; d. h. Dir ist die Kunst Stoff, den Du wissenschaftlich behandelst, mir ist die Wissenschaft Stoff, den ich künstlerisch zu gestalten strebe. . . . Den politischen Hang deiner Natur halte ich für einen zu beschneidenden Seiten-schößling, den ich mit meiner zeitweisen Neigung zum Verse machen in Parallele setze. Es ist wahr, zur künstlerischen Bearbeitung gehört eigentlich auch ein künstlerischer, von der Phantasie geschaffener Stoff; künstlerische Bearbeitung der Wissenschaft ist das Belegen eines Esels durch ein Pferd; deswegen wird der so wie ich Angelegte notwendig bisweilen den Trieb zu ganz künstlerischer Produktion empfinden, was aber, da die Phantasie fehlt, ein Umarmen der Wolke statt der Juno, mithin ganz fruchtlos ist. . . . Ebenso nun, wie mir die Wissenschaft, scheint Dir die Kunst oft nicht ganz genügen zu wollen. Sie scheint Dir oft zu unwirklich, unlebendig, jenseitig zu sein. Und dazu auch die wissenschaftliche Tätigkeit zu abstrakt. So willst Du Leben lebendig gestalten."

Es ist die Zeit, in der sich ein Börne, ein Menzel, sogar ein Gervinus abwendet von der Dichtung zu Gunsten der Politik, eine

Wendung, die Strauß keineswegs und Vischer nur aus Lebens- und Tatendrang mitmacht. So erscheinen in diesem Briefwechsel viele Züge, die typisch für die Epoche sind und den Zwiespalt verraten, dem sich kein Sohn jener Zeit entziehen kann. Sie nehmen freilich entschieden Partei gegen Menzel und Börne und bejahren das Erbe Goethes (trotz Vischers Faustparodie). Sie haben ein tiefes Verständnis für Mörikes dichterische Originalität, trotz ihrer Versuche, ihn aus seiner Abgeschiedenheit zu ziehn, ihn zum Studium der Geschichte (!) zu bewegen. Eine Stelle aus Strauß' Briefen gehört zu dem Innigsten, das über Mörike gesagt worden ist: "Mörike nimmt nur eine Hand voll Erde, drückt sie ein wenig, und alsbald fliegt ein Vögelchen davon." (54) Aber schon über Heine fallen ihre Urteile nicht ganz zusammen und Strauß muß ihn gegen Vischer und gegen Pfizers moralisierendes Unverständnis verteidigen:

Dann halte ich auch auf die "romantische Schule" teilweise sehr viel. Man bekommt die Leute doch immer vor's Gesicht, von denen er spricht, und auch, wo es ihnen fehlt, trifft er meist . . . Er [Pfizer] sagt: . . . manche Lieder von Heine wären schön, wenn sie nicht so ironisch abschnappten!, Gerade als wollte einer sagen, es wäre ein gutes Essen um einen Hering, wenn er nicht so herb wäre, oder um eine Muskatellertraube, wenn sie nicht, wie man sagt, nach Katzendreck schmeckte. Dann, wie schulmeisterisch die Anmerkung: Die Scene in der Stube des Pfarrers (oder des Försters, ich weiß nicht mehr, kurz wo die ungeratenen Kinder sind) gehöre der malenden Poesie an, diese sei aber eigentlich eine Abart, denn die Poesie stelle in der Zeit dar, Malerei im Raum; es ist garnicht wahr, daß das malende Poesie ist, wie etwa bei Matthison, sondern es ist embryonische Handlung; man sieht nicht, wie dies Mädchen dasitzt, der Sohn auf und abgeht, sondern indem man dies zwar allerdings zunächst sieht, bekommt man die Perspektive darauf, was jedes in der Folge tun und was aus ihm werden wird. (54-55)

Solche vorzüglichen einfühlenden Einzelbeobachtungen sucht man vergebens bei dem Asthetiker Vischer, der zu sehr um abstrakte Ideen bemüht ist und der von Strauß auf den von jenem bei Schiller vermißten Humor aufmerksam gemacht wird. Strauß gibt auch einen glänzenden Vergleich zwischen Ödipus und Kleists *Zerbrochenem Krug*:

Wie dieser [Ödipus], ohne sein Verbrechen zu kennen, mithin unbefangen, drauf los untersucht und dadurch ein Glied seiner Untat ums andre hervorgräbt—so weiß hier der Richter, daß er selbst das begangen hat, worauf er requirieren soll, und sucht somit befangen, auf jedem Schritte die Untersuchung, die er doch selbst führen muß, zu hemmen oder auf Seitenwege zu leiten, bringt aber doch am Ende seine Schande an den Tag. Daß jener, trotz aller Abmahnungen, doch dasjenige herausbringen will und am Ende herausbringt, wovon er nicht weiß, daß es seine eigene Schuld ist, ist das Tragische; daß dieser, trotz aller Bemühungen und Winkelzüge, doch dasjenige herausbringen muß wovon der Schuft wohl weiß, daß er selbst es peccirt hat, ist das Komische.

Wenn Nietzsche diesen Strauß später in einem seiner leichtsinnig subjektiven Urteile den Erzphilister nennt, so geht das aus

einem Temperaments- und Generationsunterschiede hervor: sie sind durch 36 Jahre getrennt. Beide, Strauß sowie Vischer tragen trotz ihrer Verschiedenheit sowohl Züge biedermeierischer Enge wie jungdeutscher Zerrissenheit. Sie sind beide ohne eigentlich erotischen Instinkt. Ihr Verhältnis zur Frau ist kleinbürgerlich, zurückgeblieben hinter den Errungenschaften der Romantik. Sie heiraten zu spät und ohne Glück, Strauß mit 34, Vischer mit 37 Jahren. Sie leben in kleinen Nestern, deren Eingeschränktheit sie peinlich fühlen, aber von denen sie nur schwer loskommen können. Einige Meilen Entfernung trennen sie wie ein Ozean. Sie fühlen sich versauern, lebendig tot sein. Immer müssen sie sich fragen: Was sagen die Leute, die Kollegen, der Minister, die Regierung?

Shakespeare, schreibt Vischer einmal, ist schonunglos, schrecklich, jeder Zoll ein Mann und doch ein Kind, ein Träumer, ein Somnambuler und doch gesund, derb und grob. . . . Setze Shakespeare nach Tübingen, nimm ihm jeden Spaß, Weib und Kind und sein Theater, Londons schöne Frauen und lustige Kameraden, so hat er ausgesungen. (302)

Die Briefe vertiefen sich mit den Jahren, besonders nach dem Tode des Freundes Märklin, der auf beide einen tiefen Eindruck macht. Man legt den Band aus der Hand mit der Hoffnung, diese Männer noch weiter begleiten zu dürfen, selbst wenn man weiß, daß der folgende Band, der für 1953 versprochen ist und sich bereits in Druck befindet, mit dem tragischen Ende dieser Freundschaft schließt.

ERNST FEISE

Georg Büchner. By A. H. KNIGHT. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951. Pp. 181. Sh. 21.

A sweeping statement opens the present study: "Goethe alone excepted, no writer in the German language, of any epoch, shows more unmistakable signs of genius than Georg Büchner, whose creative work . . . came to an end almost before it was begun." The impressionistic manner of this declaration is in striking contrast with the character of the book. For it attempts "to give as full a critical description as is feasible of the man and his works, and to draw certain conclusions from a cautious, English standpoint." It is a work of absolute scholarly honesty, meticulous, and wary of one-track statements.

Its plan is well-balanced: A chapter of about sixty pages is devoted to Büchner's Life, Letters, and Personality, one of about a hundred to his Works (31 to *Woyzeck*, 24 to *Dantons Tod*, 19 to *Leonce und Lena*, 14 to *Lenz*), and the rest to his Philosophical and Scientific Writings and Translations. If this distribution reflects a considered hierarchy of poetic values, it shows good

judgment and it will certainly contribute to the gradual recognition of *Woyzeck* as Büchner's most perfect creation. This drama has been overshadowed too long by the earlier and wider-spread fame of *Dantons Tod* with its more obvious and more superficial merits, "for all the first plays in the world's literature, . . . the most remarkable" and one of the most original. *Lenz* is somewhat slighted, to be sure; it does not lend itself easily to the kind of approach favored in this monograph. A word about this later.

Reliability of background information, radical soberness, and extreme caution of judgment are the outstanding characteristics of this study, good antidotes against the emotional and prejudiced interpretation of Büchner's work by some German critics. The portrait of his mind and temperament is well documented by letters and reports; it is drawn with insight and sympathy. It matches plausibly the psychologically coherent account of Büchner's political ideas and activities—or withdrawal from activities—and the direct interpretation of his literary works. Since Gundolf's and Viëtor's arguments are now augmented by those of Prof. Knight, it should no longer be possible to read *Dantons Tod* and *Woyzeck* primarily as *pièces à thèse* in the political, social, or economic sphere. Büchner's passionate interest in the impact of economic misery on man is beyond discussion, but his interest in man is even greater. *Dantons Tod* is "a play about human beings . . . in an unfriendly universe, an example drawn from . . . history of the tragic nature of existence . . . and the hopelessness of all effort."

Despite his gift for felicitous phrasing and summing up as shown in the two instances above, the author's use of critical methods in accordance with the rules of the trade, but not always in response to the peculiar demands of the works in question, produces results which to us, unfortunately, not rarely look pointless, even when convincing. The strength of his book lies rather in instinctive, somewhat generally worded awareness of poetic effectiveness and in the elucidation of Büchner's ideas than in sensitive, yet disciplined analysis of works of art as works of art, of form as a carrier of meaning. *Lenz*, for example, cannot be dealt with adequately without close examination of its all-revealing prose. Nor can the peculiarity and greatness of Büchner's dramas be discussed very well without determined efforts to find out specific facts about the inner consistency of their language and about their other means of creating characters, atmosphere, and pathos. If the author is not naturally inclined to cope with tasks of this sort, he could have used the findings of Winkler's admirable dissertation on *Woyzeck*, mentioned in his Bibliography. (By the way, we miss there the edition of the play in the Insel-Bücherei by the dramatist Ernst Hardt. Based on Bergemann's text, but slightly different

in the sequence of the scenes, it is generally regarded as the best version, and the only one easily obtainable).

Without opportunity for a detailed review of this first solid account of Büchner in the English language, we wish to state that doubts about some of its aspects and views have not destroyed our first impression that it is an excellent introduction into the poet's thought and work.

FRANZ H. MAUTNER

Gambier, Ohio

W. B. Yeats: the Tragic Phase. By VIVIENNE KOCH. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1951. Pp. 151. \$2.25.

The Tragic Phase is an intensive commentary on seven of Yeats's last poems. Throughout, Miss Koch is deeply concerned with poetics and sensitive to nuances that elude the less perceptive reader. She is frequently able, therefore, to reach rather centrally into the poems by detecting the values of Yeats's symbols and of the overtones of his syntax and metrics. One may object that facts are occasionally distorted to conform to what this sensitivity wishes the poems to say, and to what a responsive imagination wishes it could elaborate upon. For example, I cannot find in the line "Daybreak and a candle-end" an "incomplete anapaestic last foot"; the plummet in "The Statues" is clearly an instrument for determining the perfect vertical line and not for "the precise sounding of depths" (no matter how much one hopes to embroider the poem with factitious ambiguities), and if it did measure "depths" the image would destroy the absence of character that is the essence of the statues. One may object to elementary instruction in the significance of word-order ("Myself must I remake" vs. "I must remake myself") and of metonymy ("Empty eyeballs cannot, of course, logically 'know' anything"). One may object to the fact that the Introduction postulates the centrality of sexual love in the last poems but that the analyses find it relevant to only two of them. The book is spotted by a number of these blemishes, but one is willing to wish them away because of the many provocative *appercus*. As a contribution to an understanding of Yeats it is adequate.

It is not as a study of Yeats that Miss Koch's book is disturbing, but as a striking example of a traumatic condition nearly endemic to modern literary studies. We have become so beset by a ritual of analysis that we hardly know any longer how to attend a poetic service, as though we fear least we be found reading the Bible backwards. We are circumscribed by "fallacies"—the biographical, the affective, the historical, the ideological, the extra-textual—so that a neurosis sets in as we frantically search for a loophole

through which to break out of their circle and get at the work of art. Miss Koch knows the commandment to read a poem as a poem and not as another thing, and is eager to subscribe to it. Now, this is an excellent doctrine so long as it means that poetry is a special form of communication and makes its statement in part through means peculiar to itself. When, however, it comes to mean that everything the poem communicates is completely defined within its own limits and nowhere else, it has set up the conditions for critical neurosis. As Miss Koch states the "Thou shalt," the reader is "to let only that particular poem and no other source—whether in poetry or in prose—determine, *in so far as is possible*, what its meaning is." (The phrase she italicizes is itself nicely ambiguous. Does it mean that a poem may fall short of displaying its full meaning without extra-textual aid? or that the full meaning of a poem is an unattainable goal? Or, in the manner of artistic ambivalences, does it mean both?) Presumably, then, Miss Koch will confine herself to the poems and eschew what she calls "extra-poetic filling-in." If this means the neglect of knowledge that may be superficially relevant to the poem but extraneous to it as poetry, we can applaud—if we are confident we know where to draw the line between the two. The traumatic condition arises when we fear to go outside the poem at all. But (to choose only the most basic grounds) poems are expressions in the form of words; and words do not contain their own meaning. We may all recognize the meaning conventionally assigned to a word; but words may also have local values, and even personal ones, and we may need extra-textual aid in discovering them. To resolve this tension between absolutist theory and practical need, an interesting rhetorical shift has been developed by recent explicators. For example, Yeats writes of "all those warty lads / That by their bodies lay," and Miss Koch cogently points to the power in the homeliness of the word "warty." She also knows that the word among the Irish peasantry has the sense of "sexually powerful" and that Yeats has made this point in a letter; but this is outside the poem. Therefore she concludes that it only "enriches" the customary meaning and quality of the word to know its provincial sense. It is as though the quality of a word resides wholly inside the poem, but its meaning is outside it, and as though meaning is incidental to quality, and not the other way around. A death on straw, we are told, is an expression intelligible in itself, but its meaning is "heightened" if we know that in Scotland "strawdeath" is an ignominious death. Definition is secondary. But no matter how much this rhetorical method inverts the normal workings of words, it allows the expicator to remain faithful to the pledge of critical purity while letting the "extra-poetic" facts enter through the back door. The method also allows biographical facts to make their appearance without being formally introduced. No biographical details, we are told,

are needed to make "A Bronze Head" available to us (I do not necessarily quarrel with the thesis). We need not know that the setting is the Dublin Municipal Gallery (and thus we know the setting); it is "interesting" but of no special value to see the relation between the poem and Yeats's beliefs derived from Eastern mysticism; it is irrelevant that the head is that of Maud Gonne (but thereafter the bronze head is consistently referred to as "Maud"); and we "need not identify McTaggart as the philosopher who wrote the *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*" (but I am grateful for this information and the author's amplification of it, and wish for more in order to get at the heart of Yeats's meaning). Despite this recurrent reaching outside the text, the author concludes the chapter on "A Bronze Head" with the statement that "Whenever possible, in critical reading, we must put our faith in the poem, letting it do the work for us," although a paragraph earlier she has found it "useful" to see the poem against the characterization of Emer in *The Only Jealousy of Emer*. "Interesting," "useful," "helpful," "enriching" are the instruments for introducing paraleipsis, which, no matter how it is used, remains a device of rhetoric, not a consistent program for poetic analysis.

Sometimes the technique for being both "poetic" and "extra-poetic" is not quite so subtle, as in Miss Koch's evaluation of sources. The "mere tracking down of sources," she makes a special point of saying, "is not an organic way to explore imagery" (p. 95). Yet on the very same page she explains that Yeats may have been struck by the word "gyre" in Francis Thompson's poem, and I do not find that in any way has she shown how this source gets "incorporated into the special affective complex which the poem is." Moreover, to support the conclusion that in "The Gyres" the Rocky Face is the poet's anti-self she quotes evidence from "Ego Dominus Tuus." But since this is evidence outside "The Gyres," she writes it off as "exciting," although she proceeds to operate on the basis of the evidence so gained. In this way we are able to arrive at a definition of the name and at the same time forget where we got it. The most obvious evidence of Miss Koch's contention with herself appears in her approaches to "The Statues" and "A Bronze Head." I think I need only quote her. In one of these chapters, having brushed aside biographical information, she writes, "The question I want to consider is whether by systematically following the signposts provided by the poem *itself* we shall discern a self-contained unit of experience." The other chapter begins with the frank confession that Miss Koch intends to make extensive use of Yeats's prose work, *A Vision*. "Of course, the real critical test of the obscurity would be to see just how far the poem 'worked' without this resource. . . . Still, to obstruct the use of electric

light merely because one wants to prove that one *can* read by candle-light is a wasteful pastime."

I do not pretend that I know how to heal this division, but I should like to offer a small suggestion. If we cease to divorce poetry from all other forms of discourse and recognize it as only a special member of the genus, we shall care less about going outside the poem. Insofar as it is a verbal statement it requires all the relevant external aids we can bring to it, even if they derive from biography, a dictionary of provincialisms, or a book on philosophy by McTaggart—so long as these aids are brought to bear upon the poem as a communication in words. To deny these aids is to deny that a poem is verbal. But a poem also communicates by its own special means—meter, imagery, rhyme, an especially flexible syntax, a dramatic evolution, a total structure; and, once the purely verbal statement is richly understood, one is examining poetry as poetry and not as another thing when he seeks to unfold the "meaning" further through what these purely poetic statements say. Poetry is not other than prose; it is prose and something more. There need be no antagonism between what is inside the poem and what is outside it.

But despite Miss Koch's explicitly stated determination to let the poem do the work for her "rather than relying on the risky props of biography, history, psychology, or 'philosophy,'" we are entitled to question whether the poems have worked for her *as poems*. When we come to examine the chapter on "The Wild Old Wicked Man," for example, we find it made up of a very perceptive section on the line "All men live in suffering"; some commonplace notes on the use of ballad elements; an underscoring of some, but not all, of the sexual imagery; and further notes on Yeats's poetic syntax, and on "warty" and "die on the straw." Granting that this summary may neglect a scattered sentence or so, I propose that these items constitute an annotation of the poem, not a "reading" or explication of what she calls "a self-contained unit of experience, that thing which, at some level, every work of art must be." For example, since a poem is a continuous discourse, one wishes to know not only the full meaning of the isolated statement that "All men live in suffering," but, more significantly, how it arises out of the first five stanzas. Where is the poetic impetus that justifies it? What is the significance of Yeats's calling both God and himself old men? Indeed, if we follow the piece in terms of its self-contained, purely poetic evolution we discover a recurrence of the ideas of touching and piercing that imparts to the poem a major thematic element Miss Koch's annotative method overlooks. Young men, the poem says, can only "touch," but the old man, not loving too much, has words that can "pierce" the heart. When the lady refuses him, the old man (i. e., the poet) chooses "another mark," a target, something to pierce. This interplay then gains point in

the fifth stanza. Miss Koch emphasizes the sexual imagery in the poem and makes the sexual act central to its meaning. (Can knowledge of Yeats's biography have gotten in her way?) But Yeats writes, "A young man in the dark am I, / But a wild old man in the light." If the sexual act were central, we would expect him to wish for the young man's potency, but the syntax throws emphasis on the power of the wild old man in the light, the power to pierce with words. The power of the young man—"to make a cat laugh"—is quickly brushed aside; and the conjunction at the ledge of the line ("That can make a cat laugh, or") cascades attention upon what follows:

Can touch by mother wit
Things hid in their marrow-bones
From time long passed away,
Hid from all those warty lads
That by their bodies lay.

The poet has borrowed the word "touch" from his account of the young man's sexual power, but here applies it in the earlier sense of "pierce" by words, since it has to do with the power to touch the marrow-bones. Moreover, the antecedent of "That" ("That can make a cat laugh") is logically "young man"; but the clause actually follows "A young man in the dark am I, / But a wild old man in the light." Ambiguously, it is the old man in the light who at the same time has the power to be a young man in the dark that can make a cat laugh or can touch things hid in the marrow-bones. The antecedent of "That" is both the young man and the old, or rather the old man alone since he contains the young man. The gradual fusion of the images to this point where the power to pierce by words has subsumed the power to touch by body states, I suggest, that Yeats is concerned, not with sexual union itself, but primarily with poetry as a refinement and heightening of an act which at a lesser level is sexual union. In this pattern of values, then, lies the reason for calling God also an old man, or, as the lady more tellingly calls him, "an older man." The young man can touch, the old man can pierce, but the poem grants God the power to pierce even more deeply: he has a "stream of lightning" that can burn out suffering. There are, therefore, three levels in the poem: physical union, penetration by poetry, and union with God. Sexual love is not the central subject of the poem; it is the central concept and therefore the central metaphor, which is carried through even in the treatment of divine love: the lady has given "it all to an older man." The imagery of the poem consistently falls into the pattern of these three levels: young, old, older; home, hills, sky; touch, pierce, burn out; dark, light, lightning. This internally contained relationship of physical senses and poetry gives point to the grammatical structure of the opening lines and makes them epigraphic: "Because I am mad

about women / I am mad about the hills." Having assumed that the poem is about sexual union, Miss Koch must explain away the first line as a "seemingly subordinate clause." The true theme, she adds, "is the speaker's madness for women and not his madness for the hills," and Yeats is inverting the grammar for an ironic rhetorical purpose. But if, as the poem reveals internally, the power of the old man subsumes the power of the young man, Yeats means precisely because he has the zest for sexual union he is mad about the hills, the higher regions, above which are the skies of the yet older and more penetrating man, God.

But I do not pretend to be explicating the poem. I merely intend to distinguish between Miss Koch's annotations, which throw spotlights on the pieces of the poem, the poem remaining static, and the kind of explication which considers the organically interrelated artistry and hence discovers the dynamic workings of the poem, its intentional thrust.

EARL R. WASSERMAN

Methods In Structural Linguistics. By ZELLIG S. HARRIS. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 1951. xvi + 384 p.

The title of this book is rather misleading. In spite of the plural, it contains only one method, the author's own. Zellig S. Harris does not summarize or discuss other methods of structural analysis, proposed by other linguists, even by American scholars (it would have been interesting to hear his opinion of Kenneth L. Pike's analysis of intonation and tone). All he does is to give some bibliographical references, chosen at random and without any importance for his text (e.g. the reference p. 197 to Hjelmslev and Uldall, *An Outline of Glossematics*, which has never appeared).

Zellig S. Harris' method will be no novelty for readers of Language and the International Journal of American Linguistics, where he has published a series of articles exemplifying it in various aspects: *Morpheme Alternants in Linguistic Analysis* (Lang. 1942), *Simultaneous Components in Phonology* (ib. 1944), *Discontinuous Morphemes* (ib. 1945), *From Morpheme to Utterance* (ib. 1946), *Structural Restatements* (IJAL 1947), *Compositional Analysis of a Hebrew Paradigm* (Lang. 1948), etc. The great advantage of the present volume is that it assembles all these procedures into a coherent system of complete linguistic analysis.

The advantage would have been still greater if the book had been more easy to read. Without any evidence of necessity, it has been composed in such a way as constantly to trip the reader up. It is a sort of house with three floors, and one has the tiresome task of running up and down the stairs all the time: from the text

itself to the notes (which often fill half a page), from the notes to the text, from the text to the appendices, which must always be sought far away from the chapters they belong to, back to the text, and so on.

In spite of these difficulties, the book must be highly recommended for the consistency with which the method has been elaborated on the basis of some of the most characteristic tendencies in the American linguistic tradition founded by Leonard Bloomfield. At first glance this method seems radically different from modern European structuralism, but it is the reviewer's impression that this difference is one of superficial theory and formulation, while the underlying practical procedures seem to correspond far more closely. The book might perhaps be recommended especially to European structuralists, who might thereby be inspired to abandon entirely the mentalism with which they are so deeply affected.

The greatest theoretical difference between modern American and European structuralism is the conception of language itself. In Europe a language is generally considered to consist of two planes, expression and content, the elements of each being recognized by the interrelation between the two planes, the so-called commutation test. For American linguists, language has only one plane (= expression).

In effect, Bernard Bloch is very far from the European view when he wishes to determine phonemes on a purely phonetic basis, without any sort of commutation with the content. But Zellig S. Harris does not go so far. First, he does not have recourse to the phonetic substance, but analyses phonemes in terms of their purely formal distribution. And secondly he admits, though reluctantly and only in a footnote (p. 7), that distribution does not suffice, that the criterion of relation to content is necessary for distinguishing phonemes: "In principle, meaning need be involved only to the extent of determining what is repetition. If we know that *life* and *rife* are not entirely repetitions of each other, we will then discover that they differ in distribution." And thus we are back to Bloomfield's fundamental assumption: "we must assume that in every speech-community some utterances are alike in form and meaning" (Language 78).

It might seem a paradox that we can reproach Harris with being too "psychological" in his use of the commutation test. But his phonemic distinctions depend in the last analysis on the subjective judgement of the informant: "the test of segment substitutability is the action of the native speaker" (p. 31). That is to say that his method of determining phonemes follow exactly the same lines as in the Prague school phonology, being a psychological or sociological study, a sort of Gallup test, instead of a purely linguistic analysis.

Content in the European sense is expression in Harris' theory:

the morphemes are composed of phonemes. And theoretically the morphemes are determined, without any consideration of meaning, as independent phonemic sequences. But what does this independence mean?—for phonemes are also independent. Harris says (p. 160) that many of these sequences must have identical relations to many other tentatively independent phonemic sequences. Here we feel most clearly the weakness of the author's statistical method. If any two morphemes differ somewhere in distribution (p. 7 note), what distinguishes them from the phonemes? And the syllable seems to satisfy completely Harris' criterion. How distinguish for instance some rare suffix from any other syllable? In fact, Harris does not avoid this confusion. He proposes (p. 164) to consider *notice* as one morpheme because we are not able to make general statements about a morpheme *-ice*. And in the appendix to the same chapter (p. 177) we are told that *boysenberry* is two morphemes, although the case is identical.

But in general, Harris' results coincide completely with those obtained by applying the commutation test, which he admits explicitly (p. 189 note). The morpheme is connected with some meaning (it is not necessary to know which), and it is distinguished from other morphemes by a difference in meaning (if this difference is accompanied by a difference in expression). That is all that has to be known, and thus we are back again to Bloomfield's standpoint. Harris has gone rather too far in abolishing all relation to the content, but his method represents a sound reaction against the psychological tendencies of European linguistics. The refusal for instance to analyse French *maintenant* as two words is due to psychological and semantic arguments. The commutation test proves that this "adverb" does not differ from the combination 'hand' + the present participle of 'hold.' But Harris' method calls attention to the fact that this construction is parallel to other absolute constructions in the language: *chemin faisant* etc. French *pendant* is often called a "preposition," but we have in the same conditions *durant, suivant* etc.

Harris' method is of particular value in treating the difficult case of homonyms, where the commutation test is of no help. Homonyms are set up if the common form would have too peculiar a distribution (p. 199), e. g. *two, too, to*, cp. French *si, si, si*, even if their etymology is the same, e. g. French *vers*, noun, and *vers*, preposition. This is only possible where the homonyms belong to different classes. If they belong to the same class, they cannot be separated even by means of Harris' method, e. g. *pole-Pole*, French *seau-sceau*.

Although the morphemes in the American sense are composed of phonemes, Harris does not hesitate to find elements below the limit of the sign, establishing thus morphemes in the European sense, which he calls components. But it is important to note

that he does this without any semantic analysis, using only distributional criteria. In Latin, *-us* and *-i* have some environments in common and some differentiating environments, they contain thus a case- and a number-component, etc. (p. 306).

If we have hitherto been speaking of theoretical divergences, there are also cases where the reviewer does not agree with the author's actual practice: for instance the treatment of grammatical agreement. Harris analyses (p. 165) Latin *filius bonus* as *fili-* *bon-* on one side, and on the other . . . *-us* . . . *-us*, which is considered as a single morphemic element. In doing this he obscures an important grammatical distinction, namely that between a compound word and a group of words. In Harris' analysis there would be no difference between *sacrosanctus* and *sacer, sanctus*. All the same the theory is interesting because it leads Harris to recognize an element "singular" in English nouns (which American linguists generally consider as unanalysable) on the ground of the environmental difference between *the boy runs* and *the boys run*.

We meet a similar treatment of assimilation in the chapter on phonology. As in English *sp* and *zb* occur, but not *sb* and *zp*, *sp* can be reduced to *zb* + a common element (p. 128). The interesting point is that this is a distributional method of arriving at the same distinctive features which Roman Jakobson sets up on a phonetic basis. But there are several objections. One is that it is seldom possible to carry such an analysis through completely (as explicitly admitted p. 136 note); it would for instance be impossible in French, where complete assimilation is very rare. Another is that it conceals eventual differences between, say, *sp* and *sb*, this latter being pronounced *sp*, but *b* being necessary for morphemic reasons (cp. p. 76). A third objection is that this analysis seems of no great practical value even in the method of Harris, since he speaks exclusively of phonemes in the following chapters.

The reason for those two cases of doubtful analysis is very clear. The chief purpose of Harris' method is to give a compact statement of the utterances of a language (p. 1, 361 etc.). He wants his formulae to give as much information as possible about the language, and that is why he wishes to incorporate in them also the relations between elements, such as assimilation, concord and agreement, which might better be used to define and characterize the elements. It is very typical of Harris' method that he does not give such definitions. He finds the elements and he classifies them and arranges them in sequence formulae, but he does not define either the elements or the categories. Vowel and consonant are given no definition in his book, nor are verb and noun, stem and inflection, etc.

Another consequence of the author's intention to conclude with a compact statement of the utterance, is that he proceeds from the morpheme to the utterance, instead of breaking the utterance down

into immediate constituents, which might equally have been possible (as explicitly admitted p. 278). But these two procedures are not equivalent. The procedure chosen by Harris seems to lead to some awkward analyses which could have been avoided by the IC-method. The morpheme-utterance-method must begin with some rather independent elements, such as the English morpheme-words, *boy*, *sing*, etc., to which diverse suffixes are added. This is not possible in Latin, where every stem is constantly accompanied by an element of inflection: *domin-us* etc. Harris is here (p. 307) forced to consider *dominus* one (independent) element and the other case-forms as a sort of derivative suffixes (accusative = -us → -um etc.), which completely undermines the case system and violates the nature of inflection. He says he does so because *domin-* never occurs without -us, -um etc., but he forgets composition and derivation (cp. *dominare*).

In spite of this it must be said that Harris' method of setting up morpheme-sequences by the test of substitution (*boyhood* = *boy*) is one of the most valuable modern contributions to syntactical theory and practice. Some of these substitutions are interesting since opposed to current analysis: *walk home + -ed = walk*, the verbal ending belonging to the whole predicate and not to the verb alone.

The great value of this book is the consistency with which the method of distributional analysis has been carried through from beginning to end. The task the author has set himself has led him to some dubious conclusions, but it has also enabled him to make many important contributions to the scientific analysis of language.

KNUD TOGEBY

Charlottenlund, Denmark

Piers Plowman and Scriptural Tradition. By D. W. ROBERTSON, JR., and BERNARD F. HUPPÉ. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp. xiv + 259. \$4.00.

The general interpretation of *Piers Plowman* (B-text) presented in this book is that Piers is "the ideal, actualized in Christ, of what men in [the *status praelatorum*] should be." (p. 7) The friars, however, have usurped the function of Piers and corrupted the church militant. The *Visio* presents the principles of good and evil (charity and cupidity) at work in the world. In *Dowel*, *Dobel*, and *Dobest* the dreamer learns to distinguish the true from the false in the Active, Contemplative, and Prelatical Lives. The interpretation is advanced by a detailed analysis of the poem, *passus* by *passus*.

Basic in their approach is the authors' assumption that the poem is an "allegory" with a "higher meaning." But the fact is that, except for a few passages of symbolism (which the poet himself explains), the only "allegorical" device is the poet's use of personifications as characters—the treatment of abstractions as though they were concrete, as though they were real persons. The names of the personifications, however, and their statements are to be taken literally. But reading "allegorically," the authors find that the plowmen in the Prologue are really "the true followers of the prelatrical life," (p. 19) the dreamer's wife and daughter are really reason and memory (pp. 213-5), etc.

The thesis of the book is that the key to this "higher meaning" can be found in the traditional medieval exegetical commentary on the lines from Scripture quoted in the poem: "Throughout the poem, even in passages unsupported by direct quotation from the Bible, the author had the *sentence* of Scripture [elaborated at the tropological, allegorical, and anagogical levels] constantly in mind." (p. 3) The authors display an impressive knowledge of medieval glosses, but the thesis is untenable. The poet of *Piers Plowman* had some acquaintance with commentaries, but nothing in Spicq or Smalley allows us to assume any such widespread and complete knowledge of the commentaries as this thesis presupposes. It requires of both poet and audience an impossible mastery of exegetical material: the poet must call to mind the exegesis that expresses his real meaning and then quote the line of Scripture which the commentary was glossing; and his audience must call to mind the same commentary to arrive at the poet's real meaning. Where glosses help us to understand the literal meaning of a passage, they may be used legitimately (e.g., pp. 41, n. 48; 179; 187). Occasionally they can also suggest the possible connotations of a detail, though not necessarily its "meaning" (cf. pp. 35-37). But most of the commentaries quoted in the book are irrelevant to the poet's literal text and prove nothing. The poem is not a cryptogram, and the commentaries are not its code book. Certainly the claim that the exegetical materials form "a completely objective test of the meaning of the allegory of the poem" (p. 3) falls down by the admission that the commentaries frequently offered varying interpretations, in which case the authors were "obliged to select . . . the one most closely related to the passage in question and through which the passage might best be understood." (p. 16) This takes us back to the text and to their interpretation of that text, usually an "allegorical" interpretation. This is hardly objective.

Some readings not arrived at by these unacceptable methods are questionable on other grounds. For example, the interpretation of Piers' pardon as the grace of the Redemption (pp. 92-3) is asserted rather than argued. The attempt to distinguish between the poet's

reactions and the dreamer's after the pardon scene (pp. 96-7) is unsupported by the text. The authors accept the definition of "Clergy" as "learning," but "Clergy" suddenly becomes "the clergy" in their discussion of *passus XIII* (p. 165).

Two more points should be raised. The scholastic psychology which the authors employ to explain the psychological personifications and processes in the poem presupposes a degree of formal education for the poet for which no evidence has yet been offered. Finally, the interpretation of the figure of Piers is weakened considerably by a failure to come to terms with Konrad Burdach's analysis. That part of Burdach's description of Piers which parallels their own is quoted with approval ("Urbild und Vorbild des Apostels Petrus und seiner päpstlichen Nachfolger"), but the more important part is rejected: "gleichzeitig der Typus des *kommenden Königs der Lieben und des Friedens*, der die Kirche in den biblischen Stand zurückführen (*reformieren*) wird, . . . drittens aber und hauptsächlich der Vertreter des armen, arbeitenden, schaffenden Volkes, das durch Redlichkeit und Treue sich den gebührenden Lohn verdient." (*Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation*, III, 2 [Berlin, 1926-32], p. 189.) In view of Burdach's massive supporting argument, this analysis cannot be summarily dismissed as "misleading" (p. 6).

The book is most valuable when it summarizes in straightforward fashion the literal level, as in the discussion of *temporalia* in the *Visio*, the treatment of *Imaginative*, or the *explication* of the Samaritan's speech. There are also some very perceptive comments about the use of parallels and contrasts and recurrent images in the poem (excluding the more far-fetched of these, especially in the last chapter). Because of the unacceptable basic assumptions and the many strained readings, however, the interpretation of the poem as a whole and of many of its details is unconvincing.

ROBERT WORTH FRANK, JR.

Illinois Institute of Technology

Geoffrey of Monmouth. Historia Regum Britanniae, a variant version edited from manuscripts. By JACOB HAMMER. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1951. Pp. viii + 292.

All medieval scholars—especially Arthurian—will be grateful for the appearance of this text, edited as it is by so careful and circumspect a scholar as Professor Hammer. "No work of imagination," said E. K. Chambers, "save the *Aeneid*, has done more

to shape the legend of a people than the *Historia Regum Britanniae*." Specifically, it has inspired Arthurian romance, not only with names and themes but also with the background upon which the writers of romance and poetry have built.

What we still lack—and long for—is a critical edition of Geoffrey's famous work, the so-called Vulgate Version. But that survives in some two hundred manuscripts, and while it has been edited by Griscom and by Faral,¹ in the first case from one manuscript (Camb. Univ. 1706, with variants from two others) and in the second from another (Camb. Trin. 1125, with variants from three more), neither of these editions satisfies our need. Meantime, Hammer, who is engaged on the preparation of such a critical edition, publishes this Variant Version which has intrinsic merit of its own. We are again indebted to the Mediaeval Academy for making this possible.

Until 1932 students of Geoffrey were unaware of the existence of such a version. In the *Kastner Miscellany* of that year Professor J. J. Parry reproduced parts of an eighteenth century copy (Panton 37) "made by the Welsh scholar Evan Evans from a much earlier manuscript," belonging to the antiquarian Lewis Morris. The Morris original has not been found. But Hammer was fortunate enough to discover four other manuscripts which are "entitled to be grouped together as representatives" of the Variant Version. Together with Panton 37, these four constitute the basis of the present text.

The sigla for these manuscripts are E (Exeter Cath. 3514), D (Dublin Trin. E. 5. 12 [515]), H (Brit. Mus. 6358), C (Cardiff Pub. Lib.), and P. As it was Hammer's purpose "to offer as full a text as possible," he chose C, which, faulty as it is, enabled him to include Geoffrey's preface, his dedication to Robert of Gloucester, the dedicatory epistle to Alexander of Lincoln, and "all speeches omitted by the other manuscripts." I have not the manuscripts here; moreover, I am no judge of the matter. Yet one might ask: why not choose E? It is "excellently written, with very few mistakes and corrections" and, although lacking the dedicatory epistle and a portion of the prologue, unlike H and C it is not a *codex mixtus*² with parts taken from the Vulgate. Missing portions could have been supplied from the other manuscripts.

As it is, Hammer follows C "in the first six books" of the *Historia* and "the first two chapters of the seventh," and "where it is manifestly faulty" he follows the readings of DEHP. E is then used for the remaining books since it preserves the oldest and best text, the variants of DHP being placed in the apparatus.

¹ Hammer, p. 2, warns against classifying Geoffrey's manuscripts according to dedications.

² See p. 19 on the "patch-work" character of C.

The result is that Books VIII (ch. 2)-XI appear first (pp. 136-208) in the C form and then (pp. 209-264) in the DEH version; but, when H reverts to the Vulgate (p. 156), C and H appear together, the variants of H being printed under C. This gives us all of the material, the arrangement of which might profitably have been indicated in the Table of Contents on p. 1.

The value of the Variant Version is that it contains additional details not found in any other manuscript of Geoffrey. The significance of these will depend on the reader's special interest. But the text shows a tendency to go back to earlier sources (cf. the description of Britain, p. 23), it gives a brief description of Ireland, p. 62, lacking in the Vulgate, and it favors biblical phraseology and inclines to abbreviate, tone down, or omit. Arthurians will be interested to note that Cador's speech on sloth (*ignavia*)—elaborated by Wace (*Brut*, vv. 10735 ff.)³—is virtually the same (p. 165) as in the Vulgate. Since there is little evidence for the division of the *Historia* into twelve books, the division into eleven—appearing in H—is adopted by Hammer.

Notable is the fact that the version represented by MS C, which is preceded by a panegyric of the Welsh race, was composed by a Brother Madoc from North Wales, and that the text of DEH—also containing details found in the Welsh versions—is assumed by Hammer to derive from "the pen of another Welshman." That gives the Welsh versions of the *Historia* further importance.

The task of editing such a text was no mean undertaking. Apparently it was carried out with scrupulous care. In the interest of the reader Hammer has made the spelling and punctuation uniform, except generally for the proper names. Although this procedure impairs somewhat the medieval aspect of the language, the inclusion of all variant spellings would have made the apparatus unwieldy.⁴

While the book has no commentary, it contains a valuable Index of passages quoted or referred to in the text and a detailed Index of names. Its publication would have pleased the late, lamented J. S. P. Tatlock, who did so much to promote our knowledge of Geoffrey.

W.M. A. NITZE

Los Angeles

³ See Cross and Nitze, *Lancelot and Guenevere*, 1930, pp. 83 ff., where 'sloth' is discussed.

⁴ But c for s (or s for c), ngn for gn, mpn for mn, and ll for bl are included.

The Lusignans in England, 1247-1258. By HAROLD S. SNELLGROVE.

University of New Mexico Publications in History, Number Two. The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque: 1950. Paper; pp. 96 (\$1.00).

The subject of this monograph will be of interest to all who study the political literature of thirteenth century England, whether the prose chronicles of Matthew Paris and his contemporaries or verse such as the Song of Lewes. In his first chapter the author summarizes the later career of John's queen, Isabelle of Angoulême: her second marriage to Hugh le Brun, count of La Marche and head of the house of Lusignan; their thwarted attempts to create a Poitevin palatinate; and their amazing success in the production of children, five sons and five daughters. The body of the study is concerned with the careers of four of these sons (and, to a lesser degree, one daughter and a granddaughter) during the decade 1247-1258 when they had come to the court of their half-brother, Henry III of England. Five chapters are devoted to a description in detail of the welcome they received from Henry and the favors and gifts he showered upon them. Another chapter deals with the expulsion of the brothers from England by the barons in 1258. A "Conclusion" underscores the principal theme of the study: that the king's favors to his relatives contributed considerably to the baronial discontent and the royal bankruptcy which brought about the Parliament of Oxford.

Unfortunately the author has not proved this thesis. He has compiled from the printed rolls of the royal chancery a record of Henry's gifts to his brothers, which is "impressive." But there is no evidence that these gifts aggravated seriously Henry's financial embarrassment. How much the English baronage were disgruntled by Henry's favors to his relatives is a more difficult question. The chroniclers and song writers are the chief sources, but their testimony is biased even when it is not misinformed. Mr. Snellgrove cites (in order to take issue with it) the judgment of Sir Maurice Powicke that the Lusignans were not objects of baronial attack until they had refused to swear to abide by the Provisions of Oxford and that the annalists misrepresented the issues. On this point the present reviewer finds Sir Maurice the more persuasive in his reading of the evidence.

Throughout the study, but especially in the last two chapters, there is displayed a strong *ex parte* feeling for the baronial point of view. This feeling appears to have led the author astray in places: certainly he cannot regard the Lusignans as low-born foreigners (pp. 26 n. 15, 82) whose marriages disparaged English subjects; nor was William of Valence "penniless" (compare pp. 26 and 25); it is difficult to follow the connection suggested between

the Lusignans' transportation before 1258 and the welcome given Simon de Montfort by the Cinque Ports in 1263 (p. 31). There are also a number of minor and technical errors.¹

Mr. Snellgrove has not, one regrets to conclude, arrived at an adequate interpretation of his materials. His study will be chiefly useful for having brought together the printed sources pertaining to the Lusignans in England during this decade.

FRED A. CAZEL, JR.

University of Connecticut

La Draperie médiévale en Flandre et en Artois. Par G. DE POERCK.

Bruges: De Tempel, 1951. I: *La Technique*, pp. 342. II: *Glossaire français*, pp. xiii + 254. III: *Glossaire flamand*, pp. 194 (Travaux publiés par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Gand, 110, 111, 112.)

This investigation of the mediaeval cloth industry by Professor G. de Poerck is divided into three volumes. To the first volume H. van Werveke contributed the historical introduction and a general bibliography. Tome II presents some thousand terms as an Old Artesian glossary, made one-tenth longer by a supplement from M. Dubois. A colleague at the University of Ghent, E. Blancaquaert, helped De Poerck in preparing the Flemish glossary.

The nomenclature is derived from commercial and technical documents. These "bans, keures, ordonnances, tonlieux, leudes, péages, inventaires" of Flanders and Artois were assembled very painstakingly by H. Pirenne and G. Espinas in the "Recueil de documents relatifs à l'histoire de l'industrie drapière en Flandre" (Bruxelles, 1906-1924). Those four volumes went "des origines à l'époque bourguignonne." The sequel was completed in typescript by H. de Sagher just before he died in 1940.

The table of contents for the first volume is indicative of the nature of De Poerck's investigation. The very headings given different chapters presuppose an understanding of the modern metalanguage: "parage, dessuintage, ensimage, bobinage, énouage, raduitage, rentrayage, époutissage, faudage, catissage, mordançage." Such terms are eliminated from the word-list of tome II.

The first volume is devoted to a survey of the technique in its mediaeval setting. Many details are given to complete a meticulous

¹ E.g., "Theodoric de Tyes" for "Theodoric le Tyes" (p. 10); "liberate" (p. 34) presumably refers to the "liberate roll"; "charters" (p. 38) should apparently read "letters close." The translations on p. 23 n. 1 and p. 56 n. 1 are defective. Misprints appear on pp. 34 n. 18, 37 n. 45, 52, and 74 n. 88. The reference (p. 13 n. 17) to Bouquet, XVIII, omits the page.

description of the handicrafts for manufacturing cloth. In these processes, the first three were carried out by women: the wool was carded; it was spun on a distaff; the yarn was woven on a loom; the loose web was compressed in water for preshrinking, thereby increasing the density of the cloth; the warp was felted into the woof inextricably so as to give the fibers a smooth surface; the fabric was scoured with fuller's earth, and thus its nap was raised before shearing; it was then dyed in a heated vat containing woad, madder, or kermes.

De Poerck's glossary of Old French adds new and valuable data to dictionaries. It corrects Godefroy often, e. g., *clauwiere*, *laveton*, *pelot*, *retous*. Dubois, who published two articles in 1950 as a prologue to his forthcoming "Vocabulaire de la draperie en Flandre et dans la France du Nord," states in *Le Français Moderne*, xx (1952), p. 145, that the examples given for many terms in the second volume are centuries older than the date recorded in French dictionaries and that some of those terms were borrowed in Middle Dutch. I am not qualified to pass judgment on the Flemish glossary, but I feel grateful for the cross-references made constantly from one glossary to the other.

Unfortunately several mediaeval terms cited in the text of tome I go beyond the scope of tome II. I list them without being certain of the meaning: *abouresse* (p. 36) "ouvrière chargée d'ôter la laine grossière"; *brugnier* (189) "donner une brunissure dans une décoction d'écorces"; *cavé* (36) "déloyal, inférieur"; *coterel* (40) "laine nouée"; *embouquier* (156) "farder la guède qui est d'une meilleure qualité au haut du tonneau qu'elle n'est au fond"; *engadrouller* (37) "maquiller"; *gratif* (32) "laine de rebut"; *pifart* (201) "contrefaçon brugeoise d'un drap rayé"; *vaisselee* (106) "foulage." Thanks to N. Dupire, *Romania*, LXVIII (1945), p. 493, one may now define *cowé* (II p. 48) "poêlon avec queue en terre vernissée"; *deuzin* (II p. 56) "gris cendré"; *porpensé* (II p. 158) "étire, allongé."

In indicating his printed sources (I pp. 319-323), De Poerck fails to list a few: the supplements to the basic *Recueil* made by the editors themselves in 1929, by J. de Smet in 1930, and by F. Blockmans in 1939; H. Laurent, *Un grand commerce d'exportation au moyen âge*, 1935; T. Wright, *A Volume of Vocabularies*, 1873. This last work was used to translate the description of a treadle loom by Alexander Neckam. The same extract is translated by U. T. Holmes, *Daily Living in the Twelfth Century* (Madison, 1952), pages 114, 146, 296; Holmes refers to the illustration reproduced by D. Hartley and M. M. Elliot in 1931, and he inserts a sketch of the loom found in a Cambridge manuscript. Inasmuch as "les importantes archives communales de Tournai ont péri entièrement," one is struck by De Poerck's failure to mention the edition of two "Registres des paix et des trêves" by W. Benary,

Rom. Forsch., xxv (1908), pages 1-197, 936-939. Relevant material might also be found in F. Simon, *Petite histoire des tisserands de la région de Cholet* (Angers, 1940), and B. E. Vidos, *Rev. Port. Fil.*, iv (1951), pp. 269-309.

Of course, Fioravanti was overenthusiastic in proclaiming that "il n'y a point eu au monde art plus noble que celuy de la laine." Still the cloth industry was extremely important in the Middle Ages, and the prosperity of Flanders and the Low Countries depended on it. It continued to thrive in the Scheldt Valley until the fourteenth century. To meet the demand, fleece was imported from the Cistercian abbeys of Great Britain. Contrariwise, there was a great influx of weavers, fullers, and dyers from Flanders into Yorkshire after William I gave large estates to Flemish lords. Waves of Flemish artisans also emigrated to Italy when the Ciompi revolt broke out in 1378.

De Poerck's arduous accomplishment in economic history is a splendid contribution to French and Flemish lexicography. It can be used also for mediaeval literary sources, which are abundant but which use technical terms in an unreliable manner. A pertinent chronicle deals with the rebellion against Henry II in 1173, at a time when the dyers of Worcester needed to purchase woad from Flemish merchants. The leader, Count of Leicester, seeks advice. His Flemish, French, and Picard mercenaries agree to advance—not because they wish to stay in England—but because they demand wool as booty. Whereupon Jordan Fantosme ridicules them in these words, as edited in *Zts. rom. Phil.*, LXIV (1944), p. 506:

Seignurs, eo est verté: li plus furent telier,
Ne sorent porter armes a lei de chevalier.

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

Romanische Philologie. Erster Teil. Die Romanischen Sprachen.

By ALWIN KUHN. Bern: A. Francke, 1951. Pp. 464.

This bibliography of the Romance Languages is not the product of any team-work as are most comparable bibliographies. Nor is it a skeleton agglomeration of dry titles. The present task was arduous, but Kuhn was adequately prepared by contributing a survey of Romance Linguistics in Germany up to 1948 in the first *Suplemento Bibliográfico* of the "Revista Portuguesa de Filologia" and by completing an extensive bibliography of general Romance Linguistics up to 1950 for the *ZRPh*.

The Marburg Professor starts with an expression of regret over the accepted cleavage between literature and language, which forces

him to postpone a companion volume on "Die Romanischen Literaturen." In the three introductory chapters, Kuhn presents a synthesis of the doctrines of the great pioneers; he clarifies several of the current trends; he distinguishes between substratum and superstratum in ancient Romania; he discusses the diffusion of Vulgar Latin, the phonetic process, comparative philology, and dialectology. If one judges the other six chapters geographically, one must admire the compiler for keeping abreast of recent publications in Europe, in South America, and in the United States. If one views them quantitatively, then one notices that Kuhn is very eclectic in the case of Gallo-Romance, less discriminating with regard to Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian, but quite comprehensive in treating Balkan-Romance, Sardinian, Rheto-Romance, and Catalan. His running commentary annotates thousands of items systematically and succinctly; many of them would undoubtedly have escaped the ordinary scholar.

In view of the wealth of documentation collected for this bibliography, it is inevitable that a small percentage of the data should need revision. Kuhn repeats unnecessarily the comments concerning Terracini's "Guida allo studio della linguistica storica" on pages 9 and 13 and concerning the "Carta Capuana" on pages 158 and 192. Henry Alfred Todd was the founder of the *Romanic Review*, but he is not its present editor (p. 11). When Kuhn takes up "L'Affaire Bârtoli," he mentions the philippics of Hall and of Bonfante (p. 20) but not the aftermath involving Spitzer, Sturtevant, Pei, and Jakobson in the journals *Italica*, *MLN*, *Language*, and *Symposium* since 1944. The reference dealing with Boccaccio's use of *carapignarsi* (p. 211) should be modified in accordance with *Studies Phil.*, XLII (1945), 764-768. Wartburg explained convincingly how French *grappe* was replaced by *grepe* in dialects (p. 295), but his treatment of *grappe* and *grappin* as loan-words from Provençal has been challenged in *Mod. Lang. Quart.*, III (1942), 213, and in *Proc. Leeds Philos. Lit. Soc.*, III (1933), 170. The small dictionary of Old French by Grandsaignes d'Hauterive deserved a mention (p. 318), but so did Hilaire Van Daele's "Petit Dictionnaire de l'ancien français" and Kenneth Urwin's "Short Old French Dictionary for Students." By the same token Kuhn outlines Duraffour's plan for a historical dictionary of modern French (p. 319) without realizing that other pleas have been issued recently in behalf of French lexicography: by Mario Roques for the compilation of a thesaurus comparable in scope to the New English Dictionary; by Wartburg for a series of seven chronological dictionaries; by Dauzat for the vocabulary in use since 1789; by Malkiel for new etymologies; by Spitzer for an ideological dictionary based on the impact given to words by the style of a civilization. Surely Kuhn now knows that Carmen Fontecha's "Glosario de voces comentadas en ediciones de textos

clásicos" (p. 381) is superseded by Miguel Romera-Navarro's "Registro de lexicografía hispánica," which was just published in Madrid. Anent the particular Spanish preserved by Sephardic Jews (p. 385), Kuhn lists studies by J. Benoliel in 1927 and by M. L. Wagner in 1931 for North Africa besides mentioning the "Observaciones sobre el judeo-español de Marruecos" by P. Bénichou, *Rev. fil. hisp.*, vii (1945), 209-258. For the United States, he notes the articles devoted to its survival in New York and in Seattle; it has been studied also in Rochester and in Atlanta by F. B. Agard, *Hispania*, XXXIII (1950), 203-210, and by R. R. MacCurdy & D. D. Stanley, *Folklore*, xv (1951), 221-238. Kuhn lists "Ein Beitrag zur medizinisch-arabischen Lexikographie und zur Geschichte der spanisch-arabischen Literatur im Zeitalter der Almohaden" by J. M. Peñuelas (p. 391), but he overlooks Ishaq Israeli's "Tratado de las Fiebres," edición de José Llamas (Madrid, 1945). Tilander's edition of the "Fueros de Aragón" (p. 397) can now be supplemented by his "Fueros de Novenera," by Francisco Cantera's "Fuero de Miranda de Ebro," and by Max Gorosch's "Fuero de Teruel." At the end Kuhn facilitates consultation of this survey by an Index of Authors; he could have enhanced its great utility by appending an Index of Word-Studies.

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

Connaissance de Baudelaire. By HENRI PEYRE. Paris: José Corti, 1951. Pp. 236.

—Maint joyau dort enseveli
Dans les ténèbres et l'oubli,
Bien loin des pioches et des sondes.

So writes Baudelaire in "Le Guignon." Henri Peyre in his *Connaissance de Baudelaire* has done some helpful spade-work and ground-breaking into many a hitherto untapped vein of Baudelaire study. He has contained his energies, however, to scratching the surface and has left the heavy delving, uncovering, sorting and evaluation of the treasure to others. M. Peyre's contribution amounts to a sort of commented bibliography on over 300 books and articles already in print and suggestions as to almost as many yet to be done explorations of Baudelaire and his times. Occasionally throughout this maze of name-listing, summaries and suggestions, one encounters spots of brilliant criticism. Were it not for these all too infrequent intervals, the author's rich, polished style, a witty, unpompous introduction and the obvious usefulness

of the book as a guide to research, one might—with all due respect to M. Peyre's eminence and learning—very seriously question the *raison d'être* of such a publication.

Naturally, M. Peyre favors a study of Baudelaire's "literary generation," but, happily, he opposes that "manie sourcière" in research which so riled Goethe and Valéry. For analogies—far too often fictional or hypothetical—draw one away from the poet and his text and lead one to forget that personal experience and emotion are more likely at the origin of his themes and images than any conscious borrowing or assimilation. "Les sources livresques important peu car le grand homme a recréé ce qu'il a pu emprunter" (p. 68). More useful, says M. Peyre, than the genetic method of laboriously attaching sources and ancestors to Baudelaire would be an *a posteriori* view of his fortune and influence. This would involve comparisons with Mallarmé (evasion and the *azur*), Verhaeren (the urban themes), Huysmans (satanism) and Rimbaud (the "voyant" concept). As the theme of anguish represents the best of Baudelaire's poetic art, and "seuls les tempéraments assez douloureux pour se sentir proches du sien" could invite comparison, only Pierre Reverdy and Pierre-Jean Jouvet of the moderns should enthuse the researcher on this score.

But could not all this be called a form of that source-seeking so decried by M. Peyre with, this time, Messrs. Huysmans, Rimbaud and Co. as the assimilators of a Baudelaire influence?

Among other worthwhile projects, M. Peyre suggests: An Anthology of Despair ranging from Job through Robinson Jeffers; a study of Baudelaire's religious sensibility—but one that would avoid the apostolic ardor of a Henri Guillemin who had the poet all but converted *à titre posthume*; a study of Baudelaire's influence abroad, particularly in England where "il leur apportait quelque chose qui différait moins de leur tradition poétique que ne l'avait fait Racine ou Hugo" (p. 171); comparisons of some of Baudelaire's verse (i. e., "La Charogne") with English seventeenth century metaphysical poetry and a detailed analysis of Baudelaire's peculiar genius as a poet of love—a theme evoked too superficially by Musset, too egotistically by Hugo, and, except for Eluard and the Surrealists, all but neglected in contemporary France.

Some of M. Peyre's critical comments and aphorisms deserve mention, e. g.: that Baudelaire "est complet et émouvant parce qu'il aspira au classicisme sans jamais y atteindre pour s'y enfermer dans une attitude" (p. 197); that the best loved and most influential men of letters (a Jacques Rivière or a Jean Paulhan) are frequently the least creative and the most fated to oblivion in posterity; that Baudelaire's determination to build up the myth of Poe in France stemmed, in part, from an almost psychic need to create in life a character he had been unable to externalize in literary form. "Lui qui n'avait pas possédé le don de lancer dans

la vie un personnage de roman ou de théâtre malgré ses vélléités de romancier et de dramaturge, créa le personnage mythique de Poe tel que la France et l'Europe vont désormais l'entrevoir et l'adorer" (p. 110). The reader will not, however, find such profundity and originality in M. Peyre's biographical data on the poet and his family, in his argument that Baudelaire's strength lies in the duality of a Romantic temperament and a Classic sense of discipline and proportion, or in his assertion that Mallarmé, Valéry and Claudel did not share Baudelaire's predilection for intimate confessions in verse.

If M. Peyre's *Connaissance de Baudelaire* is not likely to spur the *connaisseur* to deep reflection, it is unquestionably of interest to those of us neophyte Baudelairians and researchers in modern literature who look to our seniors for guidance and example. One feels, however,—somewhat regrettfully—that no one should have been better equipped by intelligence and critical insight to produce a thoughtful *vue d'ensemble* on the poet and his work than M. Peyre himself.

JAMES C. McLAREN

The Johns Hopkins University

Jean Giraudoux, Surrealism, and the German Romantic Ideal. By

LAURENCE LE SAGE. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952. Pp. x + 80. \$2.00 paper; \$3.00 cloth.

It is not easy to determine if Laurence Le Sage intends this monograph to be an integrated treatment of a central theme or, as the Foreword would rather suggest, three quasi-independent studies of "esthetic affinities": 1) between Giraudoux and German Romantic authors, 2) between the Surrealists and German Romanticism, and 3) between modern French philosophy and the Symbolist school and the "Romantic Creed" as found in German authors. The fundamental and striking contrasts between the precious, conceptualistic, rational-sentimental Giraudoux and the anti-rational, automatic-expressive, obscurantist Surrealists would seem to refute *a priori* any attempt to trace each back to a common source; yet Le Sage argues that these two almost polar opposites of esthetic practice and theory derive from the same German Romantic thought. His demonstration is sometimes persuasive, often doubtful, but always worthy of careful consideration.

The whole question of Germanic influence on modern French literature seems to call for some strict if not definitive treatment: obviously Laserre's total rejection of such influences is exaggerated, and Le Sage's final attack on such an extreme view would better

perhaps have been directed at another of his opponents whom he mentions briefly as rejecting the importance of German influence on French Symbolism, Anna Balakian, who marshals evidence and makes supported statements concerning "differences" which Le Sage refers to but does not discuss (*Literary Origins of Surrealism*, pp. 22 ff.). The question Le Sage would need to answer in connection with Surrealism is primarily this: if German Romantic influence on the movement is so profound, why is there such an absence of awareness of it in the works of Breton, Aragon, etc. and in the systematic treatments of the school by Hugnet, Carrouges, Nadeau, Duplessis, and Gracq? A few references to Arnim, Novalis, and Hölderlin do not suffice to equate the two movements.

In the case of both Giraudoux and the Surrealists, the mistake of "la critique raisonnante" is to concentrate upon apparent similarities in doctrines and to neglect the identifying characteristics of the artist or artists involved, namely the organizing esthetic operations of form, emotion, and expression which constitute in each instance an unmistakable *style*. The critic of ingenuity is thereby set free to establish correspondences almost at will in the lush fields of esthetic theorizing: somewhere in Kant, Herder, Schopenhauer, Hegel, Bergson, if not in Eliphas Lévi and the Occultists or Freud or Poe or Symbolist Wagnerism may be found parallels and analogues to almost any given esthetic principles. These "affinities" are always of interest, but unless external proof of influence is available, they may be dangerously misleading.

Perhaps the intention of the author is to show how manifold the aspects of German Romanticism are, that they may lead directly or otherwise to such different literary phenomena as Giraudoux and the Surrealists. In the case of Giraudoux, Le Sage establishes or reaffirms that the French author knew the German Romanticists in general, that he translated or otherwise utilized particular Romantic works, and that much in his writings may be viewed as exemplifying German Romantic thought and theory. He admits in conclusion, however, that Giraudoux is "nonetheless French." Here precisely is the paradox which is not adequately analysed: how can such a writer steeped in German influence be regarded by so many as, in Dargan's phrase, "French to his finger-tips"? Does not the answer lie elsewhere than in influences and theories?

The "General View" with which Le Sage closes his study traces more or less familiar lines of relationship between Fichte and Bergson, Schopenhauer and Gide, Novalis and Maeterlink, Jaspers and Sartre, etc. A brief treatment sketches points of contact between Symbolism and Wagner, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche, and through these to German Romanticism. The final pages develop such assumptions, doubtful to this reviewer, as "The mystic ecstasy of the German Romantic soul is the goal of the twentieth-century

writer who aspires . . . to communicate with the absolute." Le Sage modestly disclaims any "pretence to completeness" in his treatment. It contains rewarding and challenging insights, and one's disagreements with it are always made in a spirit of respect for a keen and perceptive scholar.

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

Washington University

Le Mirage russe en France au XVIII^e siècle. Par ALBERT LORTHOLARY. Paris: Boivin (1951). Pp. 411.

It began with the praise of Peter the Great and continued with that of Catherine II. Fontenelle and Voltaire headed the first gush of enthusiasm; Diderot, Voltaire, and Grimm, the second. The *philosophes* knew nothing of Russian history earlier than Peter's reign and refused to listen to travelers who pointed out that the reforms of Peter and Catherine affected few of the Russian people. Russian literature had no influence upon them as they were quite ignorant in regard to it. But Peter was useful to them, as his myth indicated how easily barbarians could be civilized, and Catherine was still more so, for she helped their struggle against French traditionalism, she pensioned Diderot, and she gave other evidence of her generosity, though her *philosophes* cost her less than her lovers. In return they acted as her press agents in western Europe. Voltaire defended her attack on Poland and Turkey. He refused to discuss her complicity in her husband's murder, as he considered it a family affair that did not concern him. Catherine was represented as a liberal sovereign inspired by the teachings of the *philosophes*. And Catherine aided in the creation of her own legend, while taking good care to keep advanced ideas from interfering with her government of Russia.

M. Lortholary brings out these and many other points in his interesting and excellently documented book. He indicates the general attitude of the French towards Russia in the seventeenth and earlier centuries,¹ shows that the Czar could be considered a joke in the time of Louis XIV,² and holds that, after his death

¹ To evidence cited by L. I would add the estimate of the Russians given by Moréri (*s. v.* Moscovie) in 1674: "Ils sont si faineans qu'il semble que l'oisiveté soit leur partage naturel. De là vient que l'ivrognerie est si commune parmy eux, qu'il y a peu de personnes qui en soient exemts"; and evidence of the curiosity excited in Paris by the arrival of the first Russian diplomatic mission:

On dit qu'ils sont montez sur de petits Bidets,
Pour les voir on s'étouffe à la porte Baudets.

(Raymond Poisson, *les Faux Moscovites*, acted in October, 1668, scene 9.)

² "Il est la risée générale," Sandras de Courtiz, *Mémoires du Chevalier Hasard* (1703), cited by L., p. 15.

and largely through the influence of Voltaire's publications, most of France accepted the legend of Peter's accomplishments. He traces Catherine's relations, not only with Voltaire and Diderot, but with d'Alembert, who declined to tutor her son, with MarmonTEL, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Lemercier de la Rivière, the abbé Chappe, whom she detested, La Harpe,³ whom she ignored, Beaumarchais, etc. He explains the inconsistent attitude of the *philosophes* as due to their need of assistance in their struggle for the spread of their ideas, one that led a number of them—but not Rousseau—to make a benevolent ruler out of cruel and despotic Catherine.

H. C. LANCASTER

The Johns Hopkins University

Congreve's Plays on the Eighteenth Century Stage. By EMMETT L. Avery. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1951. Pp. xii + 226. (Monograph Series, xviii.)

In the study of the eighteenth-century theatre, the survival of plays from earlier times in the repertory is an important matter. In view of the conflicting notions about comedy that are found in the criticism of the time, from the days of Collier or Steele to those of Goldsmith and beyond, the stage-history of Restoration comedies has extraordinary significance. I believe nowadays the comedies of Congreve are regarded as the supreme examples of this type of drama. Professor Avery's account of their fortunes during the eighteenth century is therefore an important contribution to the history of eighteenth-century drama. As he says, "The popularity of a dramatist's work upon the stages of several generations is, of course, one mark of his stature as a playwright, certainly a visible standard which, unlike the private enjoyment of his drama, can be measured. In addition, public offerings of his plays, especially in a repertory system, invite frequent reviews and appraisals of his merit."

From the records of performances in the collections of newspapers and playbills (in the British Museum, the Enthoven Collection, and the Huntington Library), Professor Avery has compiled the account of Congreve's survival during the century after he quit writing for the stage. The account is as complete and accurate as existing

³ L. quotes Bachaumont's *Mémoires secrets*, XII, 72, to the effect that, whenever the receipt for La Harpe's *Barmécides* fell below 800 livres, comte Chouvalov sent enough money to keep the tragedy on the boards. However, the same journal, pp. 45 and 97, indicates that the eleven performances of the play averaged over 1200 livres and makes it probable that the Russian's assistance was required only once.

records allow it to be. It shows that Congreve's four comedies and *The Mourning Bride* flourished most during the first forty years of the century, especially between 1720 and 1740, and slowly declined in popularity and esteem thereafter. The reasons for this are found in the increasing force of the moralists' objections to Congreve's treatment of his subject matter and in the neglect of the comedies by Garrick after he took charge of Drury Lane. Still admirers of wit and critical comedy were never entirely lacking or silent.

Professor Avery has performed his task with the care and accuracy that his earlier works of this sort have led one to expect. He traces the "stage reputation" of Congreve, finding in it two themes—"forthright opposition," from the descendants of Collier, and adulation vaguely "general and unanalytical in tone," from those critics who could not accept the school of sensibility but were also not entirely at ease in their defense of the manners of the earlier age. With the second chapter begins the historical account of performances. Two appendixes provide descriptions of the late alterations of the plays that led to the temporary, brief revival of popularity around 1780, and a list of performances, season by season, with casts, a very useful compilation indeed.

In his interpretation of the fate of Congreve's comedies, I think, Professor Avery has stopped somewhat short of conclusiveness, particularly in the matter of the position they occupied in the weakening defenses of satiric comedy as sentimental humanitarianism gained strength in the thought of the age. He points out, in connection with the demonstration of the decline of the comedies in favor after 1747, that "the age was being told again and again, particularly in the newspapers and magazines, that late seventeenth-century drama was licentious and unworthy to be presented before a more delicate and sentimental age." One might expand this idea by showing that the two schools of comedy were in general agreement that the function of the stage was to improve the manners and morals of audiences. They differed as to the means by which these ends could be best attained. The classical view, derived from Ben Jonson and transmitted through Dryden and Congreve, is that the proper method is ridicule; this is the method of satirical, critical comedy. The newer, sentimental view, possibly originating with Shadwell and certainly apparent in Steele, is that comedy should show examples of sensibility and virtue. This latter has recently been designated "exemplary comedy." Between the ridiculous and the exemplary the eighteenth century had a hard time making up its mind, as the remarks of Johnson and Goldsmith show; and, as Garrick's prologues and correspondence amply illustrate, there was much complaining about the extinction of the comic spirit. Knowing this, we now can see that the triumph of examples over satire was inevitable. Congreve himself may have

anticipated it, when, by the time he wrote *The Way of the World* he brought classical comedy in England to perfection just at the moment, in 1700, when it was impossible for it to survive much longer. That it, and his other comedies, did persist for another hundred years, is evidence of their extraordinary vitality and the habit the English had at that time of holding contradictory opinions. This is, perhaps, further evidence of what has been called their characteristic eclecticism and compromise. It led them simultaneously to deplore Congreve's "immorality" and to enjoy his comedies, at least until the nineteenth century laid its hand upon the theatre. This appears to me to be implicit in Professor Avery's study; but no one should blame him for refraining from drawing inferences when he has so thoroughly attended to his principal task.

DOUGALD MACMILLAN

University of North Carolina

American Literature in the Twentieth Century. By HEINRICH STRAUMANN. Hutchison's University Library. London: Hutchinson, 1951. Pp. 184 + Index. 7s. 6d. (U. S.: Trade \$2.25, Text \$1.80).

Heinrich Straumann, professor of English literature at the University of Zurich, Switzerland, describes his book as "a study in attitudes." It is not a literary history in the usual sense, nor is esthetic evaluation its primary aim. Starting from the assumption that "an age has a definite character," it focusses on "the basic conceptions of life," the "values" the outstanding writers of the century have believed in (though Straumann never uses the word, one wonders whether he is groping for a translation of *Weltanschauung*), and tries to link what novelists, dramatists, and poets have expressed to a framework provided by the leading essayists and philosophers. Straumann's method is *ideengeschichtlich*; his purpose is to define the major elements of American thought in the twentieth century in order to arrive at an understanding of the "puzzling complexities of the modern American outlook."

Chapter I ("The Power of Reality") relates the "basic attitude" common to muckrakers, proletarian writers, and naturalists to the melioristic pragmatism of William James and Dewey. In conscious opposition to a popular European view of America as oriented entirely toward the future, Chapter II ("The Quest for Tradition") sees the economic success of "period fiction" (from Winston Churchill to Margaret Mitchell), the productivity of cultural historians, and even the regionalism of Willa Cather as symptoms of the American love of the past. Chapter III ("The Fate of

Man") suggests a link between metaphysical currents in philosophy (Royce, the New Humanists, Niebuhr) and what Straumann calls "metempirical" writers (*e. g.* Hemingway, Wolfe, Faulkner) whose exploration of reality leads toward "a belief in some value, force, or law beyond the empirical world." They may, like Steinbeck, remain "nearer the pragmatic and deterministic point of view" or, like Thornton Wilder, "tend toward pure metaphysics." Chapter IV ("The Realm of Imagination") briefly relates writers like Cabell, Gertrude Stein, Eudora Welty (for whom "fantasy" provides a "deliverance" from the illusion of reality) to Santayana's sceptical materialism. But the bulk of this chapter discusses poetry under the heads already established. The concluding chapter explains not only the comparatively late rise but also the vitality of the American drama as the result of a conflict between two fundamental attitudes toward experience—"the acceptance of the power of reality" and what Straumann calls "metaphysical perplexity." Needless to say, Straumann's book is more modulated than this inevitably abstract summary indicates.

Some authors are less clearly perceived than others. Like other critics, Straumann fails to see, for instance, the theological unity underlying most of Faulkner's work. But the less than 200 pages of the book take account of so many figures, including so-called minor ones, that, given the physical limitations (except for information gathered during two visits to this country in 1937 and 1947, all the material was prepared in Switzerland) complete familiarity with each writer is simply not to be expected. Moreover, despite an occasional lapse, Straumann's approach proves its fruitfulness in two ways. For one thing, the book should go far toward correcting the "lop-sided" European picture of American civilization resulting, as he says, almost inevitably from "the political and economic supremacy of the United States." For Americans, on the other hand, Straumann's conscious European "bias" can be provocative (as when he suggests that Henry Adams has not had the influence on American thought which one might expect, because his scepticism was "probably just a shade too strong" to be accepted in a country where an "overwhelming majority" of historians have been "fundamentally melioristic" and where even determinists have found it difficult to go without hope). If "the will to understand his own character" is really a "prominent feature of the contemporary American reader," as Straumann believes, this transatlantic mirror should therefore be welcome over here.

University of Oregon

CHRISTOF WEGELIN

BRIEF MENTION

Une Suite de l'Encyclopédie, Le Journal encyclopédique (1756-1793). Notes, documents et extraits réunis par G. CHARLIER et R. MORTIER. Paris: Nizet, 1952. Pp. 135. In the first part of this booklet two Belgian savants sketch the history of this journal, founded at Liège by Pierre Rousseau of Toulouse, obliged by clerical authorities to take shelter four years later in Bouillon, and remaining there until it was joined to the *Esprit des journaux* in 1793. It helped to spread throughout Europe the ideas of the *philosophes* and was much more influential than, as the editors point out, Bédier and Hazard would lead us to suppose, for they end its career in 1773 instead of twenty years later.¹ After giving an account of Pierre Rousseau and his collaborators, the editors publish the prospectus of the journal, an account of it in the *Esprit des journaux*, twenty-four letters written by Voltaire² to Pierre Rousseau, and an account of the "typographie bouillonnaise." They devote the remaining half of the work to the reproduction of selections from the *Journal encyclopédique*, concerned chiefly with Voltaire, the *Encyclopédie*, Diderot, and J.-J. Rousseau. There are also reviews of d'Holbach and Beaumarchais, a reply to Fréron, and letters from foreign countries. The monograph is attractively printed and contains three full-page illustrations. It makes a pleasing addition to works concerned with the diffusion of liberal ideas in the second half of the eighteenth century.

H. C. L.

Texte zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Tierfabel. Edited by ARNO SCHIROKAUER. [Altdeutsche Uebungstexte. Vol. 13] Bern: A. Francke, 1952. Pp. 66. SF. 4.50. This selection of German fables serves very well the purpose of the series in which it appears and will, I hope, stimulate interest in a field that has been somewhat neglected of late. The choice of texts is instructive; the annotation concerns stylistic and linguistic matters as well as the usual questions about sources. In other words, the book is well-planned. A few notes may be helpful. I should have cited L. Hervieux (p. 54) in the second edition (1893-1899). Edward

¹ Cf. pp. 37-8 and Bédier et Hazard, *Littérature française*, II, 111.

² In one of these, dated April 1, 1759, Voltaire employs the German word *Loustik*, which, according to the editors, makes here its first appearance in French. This letter was published in the *Journal encyclopédique* and reproduced by Moland (*Voltaire*, xxiv, 91-3). The text of the latter edition differs slightly from that of Charlier and Mortier.

Schröder's edition of *Der König vom Odenwalde* (*Archiv für hessische Geschichte*, N. F., III [1900], 72-75, No. 10) is pertinent to the note (p. 57) on No. 21 and Johannes Bolte's edition of Pauli (Berlin, 1924) to the note (p. 62) on No. 43. Schirokauer brings into relief a curious contradiction (pp. 3-4, 54) that I wish he had commented upon more fully. Those who write fables or refer to them call them *rustica fabula*, *gemein red*, or *Dichtung für Kinder und alte Weiber*, but such words do not mean that oral dissemination is characteristic of fables. As Schirokauer shows again and again, fables flow through literary channels. The identification of a specific literary source or influence is a typical problem in fable studies. This is a welcome and useful book.

ARCHER TAYLOR

University of California, Berkeley

The Moral Philosophie of the Stoicks. Written in French by GUILLAUME DU VAIR. Englished by THOMAS JAMES. Edited with an introduction and notes by RUDOLF KIRK. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1951. Pp. viii, 134. Two plates. \$3.50. With this edition Professor Kirk continues his series of texts on Renaissance neostoicism. This volume presents the translation of the first Bodleian Keeper of a central document in French Christian stoicism. Professor Kirk provides the reprint with a biography of James and DuVair, with an analysis of the latter's attitudes as contained in this work, and with an economical collection of notes. It would have been interesting, perhaps, to have added some remarks on James' method of translation and to have incorporated in the essay on Du Vair's neostoicism material drawn from *De la constance et consolation* and *La saincte philosophie*. The *Meditations on Job* are also interesting as a rich contamine of the two positions.

D. C. A.

CORRESPONDENCE

"WANDERER," Lines 50-57. I am indebted to Mr. Brewer (*MLN*, LXVII [1952], 398-399) for his lines from Melville; two assumptions which lie behind his comments, however, seem so unacceptable that they call for a reply. The first, that *Wanderer* was written by, or perhaps about, a (professional) sailor, is based on no evidence that I can discover; the parallel conditions of composition which Mr. Brewer envisages do not, therefore, exist. Parallel conditions, of the vaguest kind, do indeed exist, in that

both poets deal with men separated from friends; but this is not Mr. Brewer's argument, and seems to have little relevance to the solution of the problem. Mr. Brewer's second assumption, which appears to be that the inadequacy of the Old English lexicographical record justifies the translator in helping himself to any post-O. E. sense which he finds useful, seems a dangerous one. Would it not justify translating (for instance) *Beowulf* 840b and 3032b as "displaying wonder," or 99b as "lived a life of dreams"? —for "these meanings are on record."

Old English verbs, to be sure, may be used metaphorically: indeed, the senses of *swimman* and *fleotan* which were proposed in my modification of Sedgefield's version (*MLN*, LXV, 163) are, to judge from Bosworth-Toller's and Grein-Köhler's meagre records, metaphorical, or, as the dictionaries say, "transferred." But even in Modern English, transfers of the kind implied by the "traditional" version can usually be tolerated only when sufficient notice is available: note, for instance, the modifiers which explain the metaphor in almost all examples in *O. E. D.* s. v. *swim*, sense 6 ("in the Sun-beams," "in the Air," "down the wind," etc.); under sense 6b, four examples out of seven mention "sight" or "eyes," and a fifth implies "eyes" in the mention of "tear." In our passage, in a language which, as far as our records go, does not (unless here) tolerate these particular transfers, the notice is, to my mind, insufficient. There is no warning *pinceō* as there is in line 41. The phrase *seoga geseldan* will, in the absence of further definition, be taken as an innocuous periphrasis for "men." The traditional version demands that, on the appearance of *swimmað*, the mind shall, without preparation and without the assistance of significant modifiers, accomplish the transfer: "swim [in water]" > "float in air" (say), and then revert to *seoga geseldan* to accomplish the parallel transfer: "companions of men" > "companions of men once, but, alas! no longer so except as ghosts"—a transfer ready-made for the reader by Melville's "shadowy," to which nothing in our lines corresponds. I venture to think that we are on safer ground in such an obscure passage if we assume the minimum of transference, and that the senses proposed originally by Sedgefield meet this requirement better than those of the traditional interpretation. So the historical records of the verbs would lead us to believe.

But the lexicographical difficulties are not confined to the verbs. The noun *ferð*, which does not seem to survive later than O. E., is fairly adequately recorded in Bosworth-Toller and Grein-Köhler, and is there, I believe convincingly, rendered "animus, mens." The sense "anima," which seems to be required by, say, Miss Kershaw's version, cannot, I think, be established (*MLN*, LXV, 161, fn.³). Indeed, a version such as Miss Kershaw's in which the sense proposed for *swimman*, *onweg* (*MLN*, LXV, 162, fn.⁴), *fleotan*, and *ferð* are all unrecorded in Bosworth-Toller and Grein-Köhler, must at least be regarded with suspicion. Wyatt's version (*MLN*, LXV, 161), which makes *ferð* the *animus* of the Wanderer, avoids the difficulty at the cost of making *fleotendra* dependent on *cwidegiedda*, in spite of the alliteration which demands that *fleotendra* shall depend on *ferð*, the remoteness of *fleotendra* from *cwidegiedda*, and the awkwardness of the

double genitive. Moreover, this rendering gives no point to *bringeð*; Wyatt translates "brings . . . back" (whence?), but "back" is not in the text, any more than is "in the air" in his version of *fleotendra* as "of the floaters in the air." The violent separation of *fleotendra* and *ferð*, and the excessive glossing of the translation which is required to make it intelligible, seem better evidence of a "strained" version than are the moderate transfers of sense proposed by Sedgefield. I am forced to think that, until better evidence for the O. E. senses of *swimman* and *fleotan* can be found, renderings of our passage which introduce ghosts are guesses as desperate as some others which will occur to the critic if he ponders long enough: for instance, that the *secga geseldan* who swim and float might be drowned men, or even the *brimfuglas* of line 47.

W. J. B. OWEN

University College of North Wales

AGAIN ON "PYTHONISSA. FAUST II," L. 9135. In his lexicographical study of *Pythonissa* (*MLN.*, LIX, 26-31) John A. Walz has asserted (p. 26): "Goethe's use of the word in *Faust* introduced it to the German literary public." Although this may well be true, it is to be doubted that *Pythonissa* became somewhat widely used in the nineteenth century—there are three post-Goethean references in Sander's *Fremdwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1891^a, II, 383)—simply because it appears in the then hardly popular *Faust II*. The "Helena" was first published in 1827; two years later J. D. Gries, the admirer of Goethe whose translations of plays by Calderon were executed with Goethe's continued encouragement, uses *Pythonissin* in the "Personen" and in the text of Calderon's *Die Locken Absalons* (*Schauspiele* 2. Ausg., Berlin, 1840, VII, [8.] 43, 104 and 128). His choice of *Pythonissin* as a German equivalent of Spanish *Phitonisa* (*fitonisa*) may well have been influenced by Goethe's use of *Pythonissa* in the recently published "Helena." But the continuing interest in Calderon in Germany can surely have contributed in turn to the currency of a word not previously found in German works of *belles lettres*.

STUART ATKINS

Harvard University

G
[Cu
I].
1955

Gerr
Boo

Read
Ame
pp.
Ha
and

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Fishman, Solomon.—The Disinherited of Art: Writer and Background. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: Univ. of California Press, 1953. Pp. xii + 178. \$2.75. (Perspectives in Criticism, 2.)

Gibbon, Edward.—*Miscellanea Gibboniana*. Ed. by G. R. de Beer and G. A. Bonnard. *Lausanne*: Librairie de l'Université, 1952. Pp. 148. (Université de Lausanne Publications de la Faculté des Lettres, 10.)

Jones, Richard F.—The Triumph of the English Language. *Stanford, Calif.*: Stanford Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. xii + 340. \$5.00.

Jordan, John E.—Thomas De Quincey, Literary Critic. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1952. Pp. ix + 301. (Univ. of Calif. Pubs., English Studies, 4.) \$3.75.

Kraft, Victor.—The Vienna Circle: The Origin of Neo-Positivism. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1953. Pp. xii + 209. \$3.75.

Kurath, Hans, and Kuhn, Sherman M. (eds.)—Middle English Dictionary. Part E. I. *Ann Arbor*: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1952. Pp. ii + 120.

Temple, Ruth Z.—The Critic's Alchemy: a Study of the Introduction of French Symbolism into England. *New York*: Twayne Publishers, 1953. Pp. 345. \$4.00.

Weber, Carl A. (ed.).—Sprache und Literatur Englands und Amerikas: Lehrgangs-Vorträge der Akademie Comburg. *Tübingen*: Max Niemeyer, 1952. Pp. 200.

GERMAN

Goedsche, C. R. & Glaettli, W. E.—Sutter. [Cultural Graded Readers; German Series: I]. *New York*: American Book Company, 1953. vii + 48 pp.

— Steuben. [Cultural Graded Readers; German Series: II]. *New York*: American Book Company, 1953. vii + 53 pp.

— Carl Schurz. [Cultural Graded Readers; German Series: III]. *New York*: American Book Company, 1953. vii + 56 pp.

Hauptmann, Gerhart.—Bahnwärter Thiel and Fasching. Ed. by S. D. Stirk [Black-

well's German Texts]. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1952. xxxvi + 90 pp. 7s. 6d.

Kuehnemund, Richard.—Arminius or the Rise of a National Symbol in Literature (From Hutten to Grabbe). [Univ. of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Vol. 8]. *Chapel Hill*: Univ. of North Carolina, 1953. xxx + 122 pp. \$3.50.

Spalding, Keith.—An Historical Dictionary of German Figurative Usage. Fascicle 2: anführen — aufheben. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1952. Pp. 41-88. 10/6d.

Wolff, Hans M.—Goethe in der Periode der Wahlverwandtschaften (1802-1809). *Bern*: A. Francke, 1952. 272 pp. SFr. 14.-

FRENCH

Albert, Helene.—Die Bildung des Begriffs einer weltlichen Tugend bei Madame de La Fayette. *Basel* diss., 1952. 79 pp.

Andlau, Béatrix.—Chateaubriand et "les Martyrs," naissance d'une épopée. *Paris*: Corti, 1952. 341 pp. Fr. 1000.

Apollinaire.—Textes inédits, éd. Jeanine Moulin. *Geneva*: Droz, 1952. xviii + 197 pp. Fr. 580.

Babin, Jean.—Les lieux-dits de la commune de Boureuil (Meuse). Etude de caractérisation toponymique. *Paris*: Klincksieck, 1952. 212 pp. Fr. 960.

Bailly, Auguste.—La Vie littéraire sous la Renaissance. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1952. 303 pp. Fr. 650.

Bartolozzi, Attilio.—Ombre e luci su Montaigne, Balzac, Rimbaud etc. *Ancona*: Ed. Draghi, 1952. 123 pp. L. 300.

Bateman, Picard.—Tour de France. *London*: Methuen, 1952. vii + 104 pp. 6s.

Baudelaire.—Choix de textes, bibliog.; étude par Luc Decaunes. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 221 pp. Fr. 390.

Beaulieux, Charles.—Chronologie du "Livre de raison" et des autres œuvres manuscrites de Montaigne. *Bordeaux*: Taf-fard, 1951. 23 pp.

— Projet de simplification de l'orthographe actuelle. *Paris*: Didier, n.d. 47 pp.

Beaumarchais.—Le Mariage de Figaro, ed. E. J. Arnould. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1952. xlv + 172 pp. 6s.

Billy, André.—Sainte-Beuve, sa vie et son temps. I. Le Romantique, 1804-48. II. L'Epicurien, 1848-69. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1952. 452 + 397 pp. Fr. 950 + 900.

Bloy, Léon.—Lettres intimes, éd. L. Lévaux. *Meudon*: Astruc, 1952. Fr. 2000.

- Castay, Marcel.** — Les Héritiers de la couronne: Montherlant et Jouhandeau. *Paris*: Librairie les Lettres, 1952. 88 pp. Fr. 450.
- Castro, Carmen.** — Marcel Proust o El vivir escribiendo. *Madrid*: Revista de Occidente, 1952. 157 pp.
- Celarié, Henriette.** — Victor Hugo amoureux. *Paris*: Grasset, 1952. 192 pp. Fr. 330.
- Damourette et Pichon.** — Essai de grammaire. Table analytique. *Paris*: d'Artrey, 1952. 77 pp. Fr. 350.
- Daniel-Rops, Ménabréa, Secret et Farinet.** — Xavier de Maistre. *Chambéry*: Acad. . . . de Savoie, 1952. 64 pp. Fr. 500.
- Daniels, May.** — The French Drama of the Unspoken. *Edinburgh*: U. Press, 1953. viii + 263 pp. 25s.
- Desprez, Louis.** — Lettres à Zola, éd. Guy Robert. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1952. Fr. 400.
- Dhôtel, André.** — Rimbaud et la révolte moderne. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1952. 247 pp. Fr. 500.
- Doisy, Marcel.** — Paul Valéry, intelligence et poésie. *Paris*: Cercle du livre, 1952. 244 pp. Fr. 570.
- Dontenville, Henri.** — Rabelais vu de la Devinière. *Tours*: Arrault, 1952. 39 pp. Fr. 150.
- Dréano, Mathurin.** — La Renommée de Montaigne en France au XVIII^e siècle, 1677-1802. *Angers*: Eds. de l'Ouest, 1952. 591 pp. Fr. 2500.
- Dujardin, Edouard.** — Mallarmé par un des siens. *Paris*: Messein, 1952. 236 pp.
- Emery, Léon.** — Balzac en sa création. *Lyons*: Audin, 1952. 192 pp.
- Figueras, André.** — Jules Romains. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 221 pp.
- Filippini, Felice.** — Figaro . . . Saggio sul celebre personaggio di Beaumarchais. *Lugano*: Cenobio, 1952. 58 pp. SFr. 2.
- Fouché, Pierre.** — Phonétique historique du français. Introd. *Paris*: Klincksieck, 1952. 108 pp. Fr. 660.
- Frandon, Ida-Marie.** — L'Orient de Maurice Barrès. *Geneva*: Droz, 1952. viii + 493 pp. SFr. 26.
- Fréville, Jean.** — Zola, semeur d'orages. *Paris*: Eds. sociales, 1952. 185 pp. Fr. 250.
- Galtier-Boissière, Jean.** — Anthologie de la poésie argotique, poissarde et populaire de Villon à Bruant. *Paris*: Crapouillot, 1952. 80 pp. folio.
- Girardet, Lucien.** — Notre Ramuz. *Lausanne*: Vic, 1952. 216 pp. Fr. 7.50.
- Giraudoux par lui-même.** Textes présentés par Christian Marker. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1952. 192 pp.
- Golden, H. H. and S. O. Simches.** — Modern French Lit. and Lang., a Bibliog. of Homage Studies. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1953. xii + 158 pp.
- Guerlac, Othon.** — Les Citations françaises. 3^e éd. *Paris*: Colin, 1952. 459 pp. Fr. 1200.
- Hamelin, Jacques.** — La Réhabilitation judiciaire de Baudelaire. *Paris*: Dalloz, 1952. 75 pp. Fr. 200.
- Hellens, Franz.** — Emile Verhaeren. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 222 pp.
- Jouanne, René.** — Baudelaire et Poulet-Malassis, le procès des *Fleurs du mal*. *Alençon*: Impr. alençonnaise, 1952. 57 pp.
- Krafft, J.-G.** — Essai sur l'esthétique de la prose. *Paris*: Vrin, 1952. 128 pp. Fr. 750.
- Laforgue, Jules.** — Anthologie poétique. Hamlet. Ed. Pierre Guéguen. *Paris*: Club fr., 1952. xxiv + 202 pp.
- Lamartine, Jocelyn, éd.** Jean Des Cognets. *Paris*: Garnier, 1952. xxxii + 326 pp. Fr. 385.
- Le Manuscrit de ma mère. Avant-propos du marquis de Lupppé. *Paris*: l'artiste, 2, rue Dupleix, 1952. 203 pp. Fr. 20,000.
- Le Bidois, Robert.** — L'inversion du sujet dans la prose contemporaine. *Paris*: d'Artrey, 1952. 448 pp.
- Ledesert, R. P. L. and Others.** — La France. *London*: Harrap, 1952. 9s. 6d.
- Lely, Gilbert.** — Vie du marquis de Sade. T. I. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1952. 539 pp. Fr. 1200.
- Lime, Maurice.** — Gide tel que je l'ai connu. *Paris*: Julliard, 1952. 183 pp. Fr. 420.
- Luzi, Mario.** — Studio su Mallarmé. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. 133 pp. L. 600.
- Macchia, Giovanni.** — Poeti francesi del secondo Cinquecento: Du Bellay, Ronsard, Desportes, Sponde. *Naples*: Egi, 1952. 208 pp. L. 1300.
- Martineau, Henri.** — Le Coeur de Stendhal. T. 1. 1783-1821. *Paris*: Michel, 1952. 449 pp. Fr. 1080.
- Mauriac.** — Le Romancier et ses personnages, précédé d'une étude d'Edmond Jaloux. *Paris*: Corrêa, 1952. 224 pp. Fr. 390.

Michaud, Guy et Ph. Van Tieghem.—Le Romantisme. *Paris*: Hachette, 1952. 188 pp. Fr. 275.

Millecam, J.-P.—L'Etoile de Jean Cocteau. *Monaco*: Eds. du Rocher, 1952. 131 pp.

Montaigne.—Les Essais, éd. Samuel de Sacy. *Paris*: Club fr., 1952. xl + 1358 pp.

Pierre-Quint, Léon.—André Gide, l'homme, sa vie, son œuvre. *Paris*: Delamain, 1952. x + 569 pp. Fr. 1320.

Planche, Dr Henri.—Le Problème de Gide. *Paris*: Téqui, 1952. 128 pp.

Renan, Ernest.—Œuvres complètes. T. 5. Ed. Henriette Psichari. *Paris*: Calmann-Lévy, 1952. 1289 pp. Fr. 2400.

Riquer, Martín.—Los cantares de gesta franceses. Sus problemas, su relación con España. *Madrid*: Edit. Gredos, 1952. 410 pp.

Robert, Guy.—Emile Zola, principes et caractères généraux de son œuvre. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1952. 208 pp. Fr. 400.

— "La Terre" d'Emile Zola, étude hist. et crit. *Ibid.*, 1952. 492 pp. Fr. 1000.

Saint-Pol-Roux.—Œuvres choisies, éd. Th. Briant. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 223 pp. Fr. 390.

Sartre.—Les jeux sont faits, ed. M. E. Storer. *New York*: Appleton, 1952. xxiv + 215 pp. \$1.75.

Saulnier, V.-L.—Paris devant la renaissance des lettres. *Paris*: Soc. d'éd. d'enseignement supérieur, 1952. 40 pp. Fr. 50.

Saussure, F. de.—Cahiers publ. p. la Soc. genevoise de linguistique. *Geneva*: Georg, 1952. 64 pp.

Wicks, C. B.—The Parisian Stage Alphabetical Indexes of Plays and Authors. Part II (1816-30). *University, Ala.*: U. of Ala. Press, 1953. viii + 107 pp. \$2.50.

ITALIAN

Baldacci, Ernesto.—Antonio Fogazzaro. *Brescia*: Ed. Morelliana, 1952. 190 pp.

Batard, Yvonne.—Dante, Minerve et Apollon, les images de la "Divine Comédie." *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1952. 523 pp. Fr. 1200.

Buck, August.—Italienische Dichtungslehrn vom Mittelalter bis zum Ausgang der Renaissance. *Tübingen*: Niemeyer, 1952. 204 pp.

De Simone, J. F. (ed.).—Readings in Modern Italian Literature. *New York*: Vanni, 1952. xiv + 448 pp. \$5.00.

Filosa, Carlo.—La favola e la lett. esopico-

ana in Italia. *Milan*: Vallardi, 1952. xvi + 505 pp.

Foscanelli, Umberto.—Gabriele D'Annunzio e l'ora sociale. *Milan*: Ed. Carnaro, 1952. 231 pp. L. 750.

Gazzura, Emilia.—La poesia di Umberto Saba. *Salerno*: Tip. Orfanelli, 1952. 18 pp.

Lenkeith, Nancy.—Dante and the Legend of Rome. Sup. II of Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies. *London*: Warburg Inst., 1952. ix + 184 pp. 25s.

Lopez, Davide.—La voce e le forme dell'idioma barese. 3 vols. *Bari*: Ed. Due stelle, 1952. xii + 345 pp. L. 1500.

Metastasio.—Tutte le opere, ed. Bruno Brunelli. Vol. III. *Milan*: Mondadori, 1952. 1293 pp. L. 4000.

Pacetti, D.—Lorenzo di Ser Piero de Vinci, fratello di Leonardo e il suo Confessionario. *Florence*: Quaracchi, 1952. 48 pp.

Petrarch.—Rime. Trionfi e Poesie latine, ed. F. Neri etc. *Naples*: Ricciardi, 1952. xviii + 902 pp. L. 5000.

Prati, A.—Vocabolario etimologico italiano. *Milan*: Garzanti, 1952. 1100 pp. L. 3500.

Segre, Cesare.—La sintassi del periodo nei primi prosatori italiani. *Rome*: Ed. Accad. dei Lincei, 1952. 155 pp.

Squarcia, Francesco.—Scrittori romantici. *Parma*: La Bodoniana, 1952. 129 pp. L. 450.

Piromalli, Antonio.—Fogazzaro e la critica. *Florence*: Ed. La nuova Italia, 1952. xxiv + 119 pp.

SPANISH

Alarcón, P. A. de.—Novelas cortas, ed. J. G. Fucilla. *Boston*: Ginn, 1952. xii + 166 pp. \$1.75.

Alfaro, R. J.—Diccionario de anglicismos. *Panamá*: Impr. Nacional, 1950. 849 pp.

Almafuerte.—Obras completas, ed. L. Alberto Ruiz. *Buenos Aires*: Eds. Zamora, 1951. 459 pp.

Alonso, María Rosa.—El Poema de Viana, Estudio histórico-literario de un poema épico del siglo XVII. *Madrid*: C. S. I. C., 1952. 697 pp.

Arrom, J. J.—Estudios de literatura hispanoamericana. *Havana*: 1950. 163 pp.

Azorín.—Dos comedias, ed. Fr. Ugarte. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1952. xxix + 164 pp. \$2.00.

Barrera, I. J.—Historia de la literatura ecuatoriana: siglo XIX. *Quito*: Edit. Ecuatoriana, 1950. 599 pp.

- Bertini, G. M. (ed.).—*Testi spagnoli del secolo XV.* Turin: Gheroni, 1950. 187 pp.
- Bousoño, Carlos.—Teoría de la expresión poética. Madrid: Edit. Gredos, 1952. 312 pp.
- Buketoff Turkevich, L.—Cervantes in Russia. Princeton: U. Press, 1950. xv + 255 pp.
- Caba, Pedro.—El hombre romántico. Madrid: Edit. Colenda, 1952. 374 pp.
- Cirre, J. F.—Forma y espíritu de una literatura esp. (1920-35). México: Gráfica Panamericana, 1950. 180 pp.
- Coe, Ada M. (ed.).—Carteleras madrileñas. México: 1952. 257 pp.
- Coinci, Gautier de.—De Sainte Leocade, ed. crit. par Eva Vilamo Pentti. Helsinki: Pekka Kataja, 1950. 277 pp.
- Díaz-Plaja, Fernando.—La muerte en la poesía española. Madrid: Aguado (1952). 191 pp.
- Diego de San Pedro.—Obras, ed. S. Gili Gaya. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1950. 252 pp.
- Fernández Almagro, M.—Granada en la lit. romántica española. Madrid: Aguirre, 1951. 110 pp.
- Franco Sodi, Carlos.—Don Juan delincuente y otros ensayos. México: Eds. Botas, 1951. 278 pp.
- Gracián, Baltasar.—El Criticón, ed. José Manuel Blecua. Zaragoza: Edit. Ebro, 1950. 143 pp.
- Grases, Pedro.—Doce estudios sobre Andrés Bello. Buenos Aires: Edit. Nova, 1950. 181 pp.
- Guevara, Antonio de.—Libro primero de las epístolas, ed. José Ma. de Cossío. Madrid: Aldus, 1950. xxiii + 491 pp.
- House, Ruth De Mar.—Formalistic Diction in the Sp. Ballad. Berkeley: U. of Cal. Press, 1951. 103 pp. \$1.00. (U. of Cal. Pubs. 34, no. 2.)
- Iglesias, Augusto.—Gabriela Mistral y el modernismo. Santiago de Chile: Impr. Univ., 1950. 452 pp.
- Ignacio de Toledo y Godoy.—Cancionero antequerano: 1627-28, ed. Dámaso Alonso y Rafael Ferreres. Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1950. xxxix + 536 pp.
- Leonardo de Argensola.—Rimas, ed. J. M. Blecua. Vol. II. Zaragoza: Inst. Fernando el Católico, 1951. lviii + 740 pp.
- MacEon, Gary.—Cervantes. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1950. 223 pp.
- Mancini Giancarlo, G.—Figure del teatro spagnolo contemporaneo. Lucca: "R. Serra," 1950. 147 pp.
- Morley, S. G.—The Pseudonyms and Literary Disguises of Lope de Vega. Berkeley: U. of Cal., 1951. 68 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in M. P., 33.)
- Pereira Valdés, I.—La novela picaresca y el pícaro en España y América. Montevideo: Organización Medina, 1950. 142 pp.
- Reyes, Alfonso.—Trazos de historia literaria. Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe, 1951. 147 pp.
- Rodríguez-Mofino, A. (ed.).—Espejo de Enamorados, Cancionero Gótico. Valencia: Castalia, 1951. 145 pp.
- Sabater, Gaspar.—Diccionario biográfico esp. e hispanoamericano. Vol. I: A-F. Palma de Mallorca: Inst. Esp., 1950. 1014 pp.
- Sánchez Castañer, Fr. (ed.).—Homenaje a Cervantes. 2v. Valencia: Ed. Mediterráneo, 1950. 676 pp.
- Sanchis Guarner, M.—Introd. a la historia lingüística de Valencia. Pról. de R. Menéndez Pidal. Valencia: Inst. Alfonso el Magnánimo, 1950. 182 pp.
- Sloman, A. E.—The Sources of Calderón's "El príncipe constante," with a crit. ed. of "La fortuna adversa del Infante don Fernando de Portugal." Oxford: Blackwell, 1950. vii + 288 pp.
- Solá, J. V.—Diccionario de regionalismos de Salta (Argentina). Buenos Aires: Sebastián de Amorrotu, 1950. 366 pp.
- Trenti Rocamora, J. L.—El repertorio de la dramática colonial hispanoamericana. Buenos Aires: S. A. C. e I., 1950. 110 pp.
- Urrea, P. M. de.—Églogas dramáticas y poemas desconocidas. Madrid: Joyas Bibliog., 1950. lii + 97 pp.
- Valdivielso, J. de.—El hospital de los locos, ed. J. Granados de Bagnasco. Milán: Malfasi, 1950.
- Vargas, Baltasar de.—Breve relación en octava rima, ed. Duque de Alba y José López de Toro. Madrid: Edit. Duque de Alba, 1952. 105 pp.
- Vásquez, Alberto (ed.).—Cuentos de la América esp. New York: Longmans, 1952. 279 pp. \$3.00.

SLAVIC

- Cizevsky, Dmitry.—Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures. Survey of Slavic Civilization. I. Boston: Am. Acad. of Arts and Sciences, 1952. 143 pp.

1953

teatro
rra,"

Lit-
eley:
Pubs.

sca y
ideo:

lite-
1951.

o de
acia:

áfico
alma

o.
uje a

toria
enón-
Mag-

rón's
d. of
Fer-
well,

emos
Se-

o de
ana.

p.
as y

Bi-

los
lan:

a en
José
e de

e la

952.

ara-
avic
Arts

i
s
z
e
a
y
r
os
a:
en
sé
de
la
so
ra-
vie
rts

E. M. W. Tillyard

AUTHOR OF

Studies in Milton

The Elizabethan World Picture

The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt

NOW WRITES

THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE: *FACT OR FICTION?*

A noted English scholar here examines the Mediaeval and Renaissance traditions in an attempt to determine how great an upheaval, how marked a change, occurred in English literature during the transitional period. Setting forth certain differences in English habits of thought and artistic attitudes during the two epochs, Professor Tillyard tests and illustrates them in three widely separated areas of literature: the lyric, the epic, and literary criticism. \$3.00

The Johns Hopkins Press

Baltimore 18, Md.

François Mauriac's
LES CHEMINS DE LA MER

Edited for intermediate reading in
college and high school French classes by

L. CLARK KEATING
and JAMES O. SWAIN

"If the conventions which surround Rose's love and courtship are different from ours, and if her attitude toward earning her own living is also different, she is still humanly at one with brave people everywhere. Her refusal to be engulfed by the quicksands of defeats and decay makes her one of Mauriac's finest heroines."—from the editors' Introduction. Ready this month.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: New York Chicago San Francisco Atlanta Dallas
Home Office: Boston



Perfect Your FRENCH
... in this natural French setting at
McGILL UNIVERSITY
FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL
MONTREAL

JUNE 30 to AUGUST 11, 1953

Perfect your French, for professional use or for business or pleasure in natural, attractive French atmosphere at McGill's popular, long-established French Summer School at Montreal. Ideal study, conversational, residential course for teachers, students, and business people; also for advanced students of good intellectual ability who aim at graduate work in McGill. French alone spoken at all times in residence. Tuition is of unusually high standards by experienced French university teachers. Resident scholarships and university credit certificates. Co-educational. Luxurious accommodation in beautiful Douglas Hall, interesting social amenities, music and dramatics.

Fee (board, residence and tuition) \$285. (Canadian)
(Tuition only, \$125.)

Write Now for prospectus to: DIRECTOR, FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL

McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, CANADA